

Pontryagin Maximum Principle – a generalization

Janusz Grabowski* and Michał Józwickowski

*Institute of Mathematics
Polish Academy of Sciences*

Abstract

The fundamental theorem of the theory of optimal control, the Pontryagin Maximum Principle (PMP), is extended to the setting of almost Lie (AL) algebroids – geometrical objects generalizing Lie algebroids. This formulation of the PMP may be viewed as a scheme comprising reductions of optimal control problems, like the Euler-Poincaré equations arise as reductions of the Euler-Lagrange equations for the rigid body. The framework is based on a very general concept of homotopy of admissible paths and geometry of AL algebroids and goes back to some ideas of the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalisms in this general setting.

MSC 2000: 49K15, 49K99, 93C25 (Primary); 17B66, 22A22 (Secondary).

Key words: optimal control, Lie algebroids, reduction of control systems, variation, homotopy.

1 Introduction.

It is a well-known phenomena in Analytical Mechanics and Control Theory that symmetries of a system lead to reductions of its degrees of freedom. It is also well understood that such a reduction procedure is very often not only purely computational but is associated with a reduction of the corresponding geometrical structures which are hidden behind our problem. Let us mention reductions of Hamiltonian systems associated with symplectic reductions of the phase space. In the best situation we end up with another phase space of the form of a cotangent bundle. Quite often, however, the resulted symplectic manifold is no longer a cotangent bundle, so we have learned to deal with Hamiltonian systems on an arbitrary symplectic manifold. What is more, the reduction which makes sense from the point of view of Physics need not to be symplectic, so we have learned to deal with Poisson reductions. This means that we have to incorporate Poisson manifolds into the theory of Hamiltonian systems, if only we want to understand properly and to apply natural reduction procedures. The best known example of this type is probably the reduction for the rigid body: from the cotangent bundle $T^*SO(3)$ of the group $SO(3)$ playing the role of the configuration space to the linear Poisson structure of $\mathfrak{so}(3)^*$, the dual to the Lie algebra structure of $\mathfrak{so}(3)$.

We have clearly a similar situation on the Lagrangian side of the formalism for both, geometrical and variational formulation. Here, however, the situation is conceptually more complicated. This is due to the fact that not only the space on which the Lagrangian is defined is reduced, like $TSO(3)$ to $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ in the case of the rigid body, but also the variations have to be reduced and the new concept of what a variation is becomes much less intuitive than the standard one

*Research of the first author financed by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education under the grant No. N201 005 31/0115.

(see for instance [5]). The nicest geometrical situation is when we obtain after the reduction an object resembling a tangent bundle, i.e. a vector bundle with certain Lie algebra structure in the module of its sections – a *Lie algebroid*. In [5] several reduced Lagrangian systems have been recognized as related to, in fact, Lie algebroids, although different terminology have been used.

On the other hand, a direct attempt to construct a ‘mechanics’ starting from a Lie groupoid or a Lie algebroid have been originated by A. Weinstein [35] and P. Libermann [22] and developed in different directions by many authors ([7, 8, 21], [24]–[28]). The concept of optimal control in this context has been studied as well [6, 29, 26]. It was also observed that one can develop Geometrical Mechanics together with the Euler-Lagrange and Hamilton equations as a formalism based on more general objects than Lie algebroids ([11, 12]). They were introduced in [16] under the name (*general*) *algebroids*, as the Jacobi identity and even skew-symmetry of the corresponding brackets is irrelevant. This, in turn, is due to the fact that a geometric approach to Analytical Mechanics originated by W. M. Tulczyjew ([31, 32, 33]) makes use, in fact, only of a *double vector bundle* structure of $T^*TM \simeq TT^*M \simeq T^*T^*M$, where M is the configuration space of the system. On the other hand, the Jacobi identity plays the role of an integrability condition which allows to integrate (at least locally) a Lie algebroid to a Lie groupoid (see for instance [9]), so to interpret a system on the Lie algebroid as a reduction from the Lie groupoid. In this picture the role of tangent prolongations of paths in the configuration manifolds are played by *admissible paths* in the total bundle E of the Lie algebroid, so the paths whose anchor coincides with the tangent prolongation of their projections to configuration manifold. The key tool in constructing the Lie groupoid is the concept of a homotopy of admissible paths in a Lie algebroid. As we show in this paper, this concept works well even in a slightly more general framework of what we call *almost Lie algebroids*.

The aim of our work is to extend the fundamental theorem of the theory of optimal control – the Pontryagin Maximum Principle (PMP) – to the setting of almost Lie algebroids. Our motivation comes from the theory of reductions of Lagrangian and control systems (see for instance [34, 20, 5]). Some differential versions of the PMP in more general settings of this type have been already indicated in [8, 26, 12], but the full version we present here is, to our knowledge, completely novel. We decided to present a version of the PMP for almost Lie algebroids (AL algebroids for short) – more general than the version for just Lie algebroids – as it potentially admits a wider spectrum of possible applications. This is the mathematical side of the problem, although it is not easy to find concrete applications in this general framework, since the standard thinking about control problems in more general geometric setting is to pass through a reduction. We believe, however, that one can find a natural examples of control systems on almost Lie algebroids in the context of constraints, as it has been done for *skew-algebroids* describing systems under nonholonomic constraints [13].

To explain briefly the result, let us note that an AL algebroid is determined by certain linear bi-vector field Π distinguished on the dual E^* of a vector bundle $\tau : E \rightarrow M$. This bi-vector field defines, in particular, a vector bundle morphism $\rho : E \rightarrow TM$, called the *anchor* of the AL algebroid structure on E , and the *Hamiltonian vector field* $\mathcal{X}_H$ associated with any C^1 function H on E^* , defined in the standard way as the contraction $\mathcal{X}_H = i_{dH}\Pi$. The classical model is the tangent bundle $E = TM$ with the Poisson tensor on T^*M corresponding to the canonical symplectic structure. The anchor equals the identity in this case. Other standard examples are finite-dimensional real Lie algebras $E = \mathfrak{g}$ with the corresponding Lie-Poisson tensors on their duals $\mathfrak{g}^*$ and trivial anchor maps (M is a single point in these cases). On E we can consider *admissible paths*, i.e. piece-wise continuous maps $\gamma : [t_0, t_1] \rightarrow E$ such that the projection $x(t) = \tau(\gamma(t))$ of $\gamma(t)$ on M is piece-wise C^1 and $\dot{x}(t) = \rho(\gamma(t))$. On admissible paths we have an equivalence relation $\gamma \sim \sigma$ interpreted as a reduction of homotopy equivalence (with fixed end-points). The concept of this equivalence in the case of AL algebroids is the crucial and non-trivial part our framework. Note that equivalent paths need not to be defined on the same

time interval. For an admissible path σ we denote with $[\sigma]$ the equivalence homotopy class of σ .

A *control system* is defined by a continuous map $f : M \times U \rightarrow E$, where U is a topological space of control parameters, such that for each $u \in U$ the function $f_u = f(\cdot, u)$ is a section of class C^1 of the bundle E . Every *admissible control*, i.e. a piece-wise continuous path $u(t)$ in U , gives rise to a piece-wise C^1 path in M defined by the differential equation

$$\dot{x}(t) = \rho(f(x(t), u(t))) \quad (1)$$

with the initial condition $x(t_0) = x_0$, and to an admissible path $\gamma(t) = f(x(t), u(t))$ (we will call it *admissible path induced by the control $u(t)$*) covering $x(t)$. An *optimal control problem* for this control system is associated with a class $[\sigma]$ of an admissible path σ with the initial base-point x_0 and a *cost function* $L : M \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and the question is to find an admissible control $u : [t_0, t_1] \rightarrow U$ (the time interval is to be found as well) such that

- (a) the admissible path $f(x(t), u(t))$ in E induced by $u(t)$ belongs to the homotopy class $[\sigma]$;
- (b) the total cost $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} L(x(t), u(t))dt$ is minimal among admissible controls satisfying (a).

Theorem 1.1. *Let $u : [t_0, t_1] \rightarrow U$ be a solution of the above optimal control problem. There exists a curve $z(t) : [t_0, t_1] \rightarrow E^*$ (with initial base-point x_0) and a constant $z_0 \leq 0$ which satisfy the following conditions:*

- *the curve $z(t)$ is a trajectory of the time-dependent family of Hamiltonian vector fields $\mathcal{X}_{H_t}$ associated with the Hamiltonians $H_t(z) = H(z, u(t))$, where*

$$H(z, u) = \langle f(\pi(z), u), z \rangle_\tau + z_0 L(\pi(z), u) ;$$

- *the pair $u(t)$ and $z(t)$ satisfies the "Maximum Principle"*

$$H(z(t), u(t)) = \sup_{v \in U} H(z(t), v)$$

at every point of continuity of the control u ;

- *if $z_0 = 0$ the covector $z(t)$ is nowhere-vanishing;*
- *$H(z(t), u(t)) = 0$ at every point of continuity of the control u .*

Although the theorem looks quite similar to the standard one, in formulating and to proving it one encounters at least three difficulties in comparison with the classical case. First of all, the concept of homotopy for admissible paths in an AL algebroid, similar to the one introduced in [9] for Lie algebroids, is much less intuitive than the standard one and technically complicated. Second, because we accept various sets of control parameters, in particular two-point 'switch-on – switch-off', we must consequently accept non-continuous 'idle' variations that strongly differs from the standard concept of variation in Analytical Mechanics. This leads to non-continuous admissible paths as trajectories in our algebroid even if their projections to the base – solutions of the differential equation (1) – are continuous which corresponds to the classical case. Because of that, the concept of homotopy must consequently go beyond differentiable and even continuous cases, so the methods developed in [9] are no more directly applicable. And third, working with AL algebroids and our general homotopies makes the final topological argument in the proof of the PMP much more delicate than in the standard case.

Despite of all these problems, we get an elegant formulation of the PMP for almost Lie algebroids (theorem 6.1), but for the price of dealing with substantial technical difficulties in defining and working with non-continuous homotopy of admissible paths. Of course, looking

at the reduction procedures is only our motivation, since almost Lie algebroids are not reduced objects in general, like Lie algebroids are.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall what are double vector bundles and define almost Lie algebroids and in Section 3 we introduce tangent (complete) lifts of sections of an algebroid and Hamiltonian vector fields in this setting. Section 4 we spend on introducing the concept of homotopy of admissible paths in almost Lie algebroids. In section 5 we state the problem defining control systems in our general setting. The Maximum Principle is stated and proved in Section 6 modulo two technical lemmata whose proofs are postponed to Section 7. We end up with some examples in Section 8. To keep the size of the paper reasonable, we concentrate here on the theory and we present only two examples showing how certain known results can be derived directly and simply from our theory.

2 Almost Lie algebroids.

We start with introducing some notation and the concept of a general Lie algebroid as it has been used for variational calculus in [12]. For details the reader can consult [11, 12] and the references therein.

Let M be a smooth manifold and let (x^a) , $a = 1, \dots, n$, be a coordinate system in M . We denote with $\tau_M: \mathbb{T}M \rightarrow M$ the tangent vector bundle and by $\pi_M: \mathbb{T}^*M \rightarrow M$ the cotangent vector bundle. We have the induced (adapted) coordinate systems $(x^a, \dot{x}^b)$ in $\mathbb{T}M$ and (x^a, p_b) in $\mathbb{T}^*M$. More generally, let $\tau: E \rightarrow M$ be a vector bundle and let $\pi: E^* \rightarrow M$ be the dual bundle. Let $(e_1, \dots, e_m)$ be a basis of local sections of $\tau: E \rightarrow M$ and let $(e_*^1, \dots, e_*^m)$ be the dual basis of local sections of $\pi: E^* \rightarrow M$. We have the induced coordinate systems: (x^a, y^i) , $y^i = \iota(e_*^i)$ in E , and (x^a, ξ_i) , $\xi_i = \iota(e_i)$ in E^* , where the linear functions $\iota(e)$ are given by the canonical pairing $\iota(e)(v_x) = \langle e(x), v_x \rangle$. Thus we have local coordinates

$$\begin{aligned} (x^a, y^i, \dot{x}^b, \dot{y}^j) & \text{ in } \mathbb{T}E, & (x^a, \xi_i, \dot{x}^b, \dot{\xi}_j) & \text{ in } \mathbb{T}E^*, \\ (x^a, y^i, p_b, \pi_j) & \text{ in } \mathbb{T}^*E, & (x^a, \xi_i, p_b, \varphi^j) & \text{ in } \mathbb{T}^*E^*. \end{aligned}$$

The cotangent bundles $\mathbb{T}^*E$ and $\mathbb{T}^*E^*$ are examples of so called *double vector bundles* (fibred over E and E^*) which are canonically isomorphic

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{T}^*E^* & \simeq \mathbb{T}^*E & \longrightarrow E \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ E^* & \longrightarrow & M \end{array}.$$

In particular, all arrows correspond to vector bundle structures and all pairs of vertical and horizontal arrows are vector bundle morphisms. The double vector bundles have been recently characterized [14] in a simple way as two vector bundle structures whose Euler vector fields commute. The above double vector bundles isomorphism

$$\mathcal{R}_\tau: \mathbb{T}^*E \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^*E^* \tag{2}$$

can be chosen being simultaneously an anti-symplectomorphism. In local coordinates, $\mathcal{R}_\tau$ is given by

$$\mathcal{R}_\tau(x^a, y^i, p_b, \pi_j) = (x^a, \pi_i, -p_b, y^j).$$

This means that we can identify coordinates π_j with ξ_j , coordinates φ^j with y^j , and use the coordinates (x^a, y^i, p_b, ξ_j) in $\mathbb{T}^*E$ and the coordinates (x^a, ξ_i, p_b, y^j) in $\mathbb{T}^*E^*$, in full agreement with (2).

It is well known that Lie algebroid structures on a vector bundle E correspond to linear Poisson tensors on E^* . A 2-contravariant tensor Π on E^* is called *linear* if the corresponding mapping $\tilde{\Pi}: \mathbb{T}^*E^* \rightarrow \mathbb{T}E^*$ induced by contraction, $\tilde{\Pi}(\nu) = i_\nu \Pi$, is a morphism of double vector bundles. One can equivalently say that the corresponding bracket of functions is closed on (fiber-wise) linear functions. The commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{T}^*E^* & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\Pi}} & \mathbb{T}E^* \\ \uparrow \mathcal{R}_\tau & \nearrow \Delta & \\ \mathbb{T}^*E & & \end{array}$$

describes a one-to-one correspondence between linear 2-contravariant tensors Π on E^* and morphisms of double vector bundles Δ covering the identity on E^* :

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & \mathbb{T}^*E & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & \mathbb{T}E^* & \\ & \searrow \pi_E & & \searrow \tau_{E^*} & \\ & E & \xrightarrow{\rho} & \mathbb{T}M & \\ \mathbb{T}^*\tau \nearrow & & \nearrow \tau & & \nearrow \tau_M \\ E^* & \xrightarrow{id} & E^* & & \\ \searrow \pi & & \searrow \pi & & \\ & M & \xrightarrow{id} & M & \end{array} \quad (3)$$

In local coordinates, every such Δ is of the form

$$\Delta(x^a, y^i, p_b, \xi_j) = (x^a, \xi_i, \rho_k^b(x)y^k, c_{ij}^k(x)y^i\xi_k + \sigma_j^a(x)p_a) \quad (4)$$

(summation convention is used) and it corresponds to the linear tensor

$$\Pi_\Delta = c_{ij}^k(x)\xi_k\partial_{\xi_i} \otimes \partial_{\xi_j} + \rho_i^b(x)\partial_{\xi_i} \otimes \partial_{x^b} - \sigma_j^a(x)\partial_{x^a} \otimes \partial_{\xi_j}.$$

The morphisms (3) has been called an *algebroid* in [16], while a *Lie algebroid* is an algebroids for which the tensor Π_Δ is a Poisson tensor. An algebroid we will call a *skew algebroid* if the tensor Π_Δ is skew-symmetric.

Theorem 2.1. *An algebroid structure (E, Δ) can be equivalently defined as a bilinear bracket $[\cdot, \cdot]_\Delta$ on the space $\text{Sec}(E)$ of sections of $\tau: E \rightarrow M$, together with vector bundle morphisms $\rho, \sigma: E \rightarrow \mathbb{T}M$ (the left anchor and the right anchor), such that*

$$[fX, gY]_\Delta = f \cdot \rho(X)(g)Y - g \cdot \sigma(Y)(f)X + fg[X, Y]_\Delta$$

for all $f, g \in C^\infty(M)$, $X, Y \in \text{Sec}(E)$. The bracket and the anchors are related to the bracket $\{\varphi, \psi\}_{\Pi_\Delta} = \langle \Pi_\Delta, d\varphi \otimes d\psi \rangle$ in the algebra of functions on E^* associated with the 2-contravariant tensor Π_Δ by the formulae

$$\iota([X, Y]_\Delta) = \{\iota(X), \iota(Y)\}_{\Pi_\Delta}, \quad \pi^*(\rho(X)(f)) = \{\iota(X), \pi^*f\}_{\Pi_\Delta}, \quad \pi^*(\sigma(X)(f)) = \{\pi^*f, \iota(X)\}_{\Pi_\Delta}.$$

Let us stress that any Lie algebroid is a skew algebroid, so that the anchors coincide $\rho = \sigma$. We have therefore a unique anchor which, automatically, induces a morphism of the Lie algebroid E into $\mathbb{T}M$ with the bracket of vector fields, i.e. $\rho([X, Y]_\Delta) = [\rho(X), \rho(Y)]$ (see the discussion about this and similar problems in [10]). We assume these properties to define *almost Lie algebroids*.

Definition 2.2. An *almost Lie algebroid* (AL algebroid shortly) is a skew algebroid (E, Δ) whose anchor $\rho = \sigma : E \rightarrow \mathbb{T}M$ is an algebroid morphism,

$$\rho([X, Y]_\Delta) = [\rho(X), \rho(Y)]. \quad (5)$$

Of course, Lie algebroids are AL algebroids, but the class of the latter ones is broader: for instance all skew-algebra bundles, $\rho = \sigma = 0$, are AL algebroids independently what are the skew brackets in fibers.

Since the dual bundles of $\pi_E : \mathbb{T}^*E \rightarrow E$ and $\mathbb{T}\pi : \mathbb{T}E^* \rightarrow \mathbb{T}M$ are, respectively, $\tau_E : \mathbb{T}E \rightarrow E$ and $\mathbb{T}\tau : \mathbb{T}E \rightarrow \mathbb{T}M$, the dual to Δ is a relation $\kappa = \kappa_\Delta : \mathbb{T}E \rightharpoonup \mathbb{T}E$. It is a uniquely defined smooth submanifold κ in $\mathbb{T}E \times \mathbb{T}E$ consisting of pairs (v, v') such that $\rho(\tau_E(v')) = \mathbb{T}\tau(v)$ and

$$\langle v, \Delta(v^*) \rangle_{\mathbb{T}\tau} = \langle v', v^* \rangle_{\tau_E}$$

for any $v^* \in \mathbb{T}^*_{\tau_E(v')}E$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{T}\tau}$ is the canonical pairing between $\mathbb{T}E$ and $\mathbb{T}E^*$, and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\tau_E}$ is the canonical pairing between $\mathbb{T}E$ and $\mathbb{T}^*E$. We will write $\kappa : v \rightharpoonup v'$ instead of $(v, v') \in \kappa$. This relation can be put into the following diagram of "double vector bundle relations"

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathbb{T}E & \xleftarrow{\kappa} & \mathbb{T}E & & \\ & \swarrow \mathbb{T}\tau & & \searrow \tau_E & & \searrow \tau_E & \swarrow \mathbb{T}\tau \\ & & E & \xrightarrow{\rho} & \mathbb{T}M & & \\ & \swarrow \tau & & \searrow \tau & & \searrow \tau_M & \swarrow \mathbb{T}\tau \\ \mathbb{T}M & \xleftarrow{\sigma} & E & & E & \xrightarrow{\tau_M} & \mathbb{T}M \\ & \searrow \tau_M & & \swarrow id & & \searrow \tau_M & \\ & & M & & M & & \end{array} \quad (6)$$

The relation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{T}E & \xleftarrow{\kappa} & \mathbb{T}E \\ \downarrow \tau_E & & \downarrow \mathbb{T}\tau \\ E & \xrightarrow{\rho} & \mathbb{T}M \end{array}$$

is a *vector bundle morphism of the second kind*, i.e. it is represented by linear maps of the fiber $\mathbb{T}E$ over $v \in \mathbb{T}M$ into the fibers $\mathbb{T}_eE$ for all $e \in E$ such that $\rho(e) = v$. This is also an example of a morphism of Lie groupoids in the sense introduced and exploited by S. Zakrzewski [37]. To such relations we will refer therefore as to *Zakrzewski morphisms*. The expression of the Zakrzewski morphism (6), dual to Δ , in local coordinates reads

$$\kappa : (x^a, Y^i, \rho_k^b(x)y^k, \dot{Y}^j) \rightharpoonup (x^a, y^i, \sigma_k^b(x)Y^k, \dot{Y}^j + c_{kl}^j(x)y^kY^l). \quad (7)$$

It is easy to see that $\kappa = \kappa^{-1}$ for skew algebroids.

A canonical example of a mapping Δ in the case of $E = \mathbb{T}M$ is given by $\Delta = \Delta_M = \alpha_M^{-1}$ – the inverse to the Tulczyjew isomorphism $\alpha_M : \mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^*\mathbb{T}M$ [31]. The dual Zakrzewski morphism is in this case the well-known ‘canonical flip’ $\kappa_M : \mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}M \rightarrow \mathbb{T}\mathbb{T}M$. Since α_M is an isomorphism, κ_M is a true map, in fact – an isomorphism of the corresponding two vector bundle structures as well.

A C^1 -curve $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow E$ (or a C^1 -path $\gamma : [t_0, t_1] \rightarrow E$) in an algebroid E we call *admissible* (or shortly *E-path*), if the tangent prolongation $\mathbb{T}(\underline{\gamma}) = (\underline{\gamma}, \dot{\underline{\gamma}})$ of its projection $\underline{\gamma} = \tau \circ \gamma$ coincides with its anchor:

$$\mathbb{T}(\underline{\gamma}) = \rho(\gamma(t)). \quad (8)$$

A curve (path) in the canonical Lie algebroid $\mathbb{T}M$ is admissible if and only if it is a tangent prolongation of its projection on M . If we denote $\mathbb{T}^{hol}E$ the subset of $\mathbb{T}E$ consisting of *holonomic vectors*,

$$\mathbb{T}^{hol}E = \{v \in \mathbb{T}E : \mathbb{T}\tau(v) = \rho(\tau_E(v))\}, \quad (9)$$

then admissible curves (paths) in the algebroid E can be characterized as those curves (paths) whose tangent prolongations lay in $\mathbb{T}^{hol}E$. The set of holonomic vectors $\mathbb{T}^{hol}E$ can be equivalently characterized as the subset in $\mathbb{T}E$ which is mapped *via* $\mathbb{T}\rho : \mathbb{T}E \rightarrow \mathbb{T}TM$ to classical holonomic vectors $\mathbb{T}^2M = \{u \in \mathbb{T}TM : \kappa_M(u) = u\}$, that justifies the name. In other words,

$$\mathbb{T}^{hol}E = (\mathbb{T}\rho)^{-1}(\mathbb{T}^2M).$$

Note also that $\mathbb{T}^{hol}E$ is canonically an affine bundle over E modelled on the vertical bundle $\mathbb{V}E \subset \mathbb{T}E$. In local coordinates, $\mathbb{T}^{hol}E$ as submanifold in $\mathbb{T}E$ is characterized by the equations $\dot{x}^a = \rho_i^a(x)y^i$, so $(x^a, y^i, \dot{y}^j)$ can serve as local coordinates in $\mathbb{T}^{hol}E$. It is easy to see that, for skew algebroids, $\kappa(\mathbb{T}^{hol}E) = \mathbb{T}^{hol}E$.

Observe that equation (8) makes sense also if we weaken the regularity conditions imposed on γ . Namely, it is enough that γ is continuous over C^1 -base curve. From now on we will speak of E -paths in this sense.

Note also that for a general algebroid we may speak of E -paths with respect to the left or right anchor.

3 The tangent algebroid lift and Hamiltonian vector fields.

For a tensor field $K \in \text{Sec}(E^{\otimes k})$, we can define the vertical lift $\mathbf{v}_\tau(K) \in \text{Sec}(\mathbb{T}^{\otimes k}E)$ (cf. [15, 36]). In local coordinates,

$$\mathbf{v}_\tau(f^{i_1 \dots i_k} e_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_k}) = f^{i_1 \dots i_k} \partial_{y^{i_1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \partial_{y^{i_k}}. \quad (10)$$

A particular case of the vertical lift is the lift $\mathbf{v}_\mathbb{T}(K)$ of a contravariant tensor field K on M into a contravariant tensor field on $\mathbb{T}M$. It is well known (see [36, 15]) that in the case of $E = \mathbb{T}M$ we have also the tangent lift of contravariant tensors on M into contravariant tensors on $\mathbb{T}M$ which is a $\mathbf{v}_\mathbb{T}$ -derivation. It turns out that the presence of such a lift for a vector bundle is equivalent to the presence of an algebroid structure. Note first that we can extend Δ naturally to mappings (cf. [17, 16])

$$\Delta^{\otimes r} : \otimes_E^r \mathbb{T}^*E \longrightarrow \mathbb{T} \otimes_M^r E^*, \quad r \geq 0.$$

Theorem 3.1. [17, 16] *Let (E, Δ) be an algebroid. For $K \in \text{Sec}(E^{\otimes k})$, $k \geq 0$, the equality*

$$\iota(d_\mathbb{T}^\Delta(K)) = d_\mathbb{T}(\iota(K)) \circ \Delta^{\otimes k} \quad (11)$$

defines a tensor field $d_\mathbb{T}^\Delta(K) \in \text{Sec}(\mathbb{T}^{\otimes k}E)$ which is linear and the mapping

$$d_\mathbb{T}^\Delta : \text{Sec}(E^{\otimes k}) \longrightarrow \text{Sec}(\mathbb{T}^{\otimes k}E)$$

is a $\mathbf{v}_\tau$ -derivation of degree 0. Conversely, if $D : \text{Sec}(E^{\otimes k}) \longrightarrow \text{Sec}(\mathbb{T}^{\otimes k}E)$ is a $\mathbf{v}_\tau$ -derivation of degree 0 such that $D(K)$ is linear for each K , then there is an algebroid structure Δ on $\tau : E \rightarrow M$ such that $D = d_\mathbb{T}^\Delta$.

It is easy to see that the tangent algebroid lifts of a C^1 function on the base and of a C^1 section of E in local coordinates read

$$\begin{aligned} d_\mathbb{T}^\Delta(f(x)) &= y^i \rho_i^a(x) \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^a}(x), \\ d_\mathbb{T}^\Delta(f^i(x)e_i) &= f^i(x) \sigma_i^a(x) \partial_{x^a} + \left(y^i \rho_i^a(x) \frac{\partial f^k}{\partial x^a}(x) + c_{ij}^k(x) y^i f^j(x) \right) \partial_{y^k}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

We will use the lifts of sections of E to vector fields on E in the sequel. Observe that for the section $f : M \longrightarrow E$, the field $d_{\mathbb{T}}^{\Delta}(f)$ is κ -related to $\mathbb{T}f : \mathbb{T}M \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}E$.

The presence of the contravariant tensor field Π_{Δ} on E^* allows in turn to associate with any C^1 -function h on E^* the *Hamiltonian vector field* $\mathcal{X}_h$ defined in an obvious way: $\mathcal{X}_h = i_{dh}\Pi_{\Delta}$. In local coordinates,

$$\mathcal{X}_h(x, \xi) = \left(c_{ij}^k(x) \xi_k \frac{\partial h}{\partial \xi_i}(x, \xi) - \sigma_j^a(x) \frac{\partial h}{\partial x^a}(x, \xi) \right) \partial_{\xi_j} + \rho_i^b(x) \frac{\partial h}{\partial \xi_i}(x, \xi) \partial_{x^b}. \quad (13)$$

4 Homotopy of admissible paths on almost Lie algebroids.

In order to motivate future definition of homotopy of E -paths we shall sketch the procedure of reduction from a Lie groupoid to its Lie algebroid (compare [4, 23]).

Consider a Lie groupoid G with the target and the source maps $\alpha, \beta : G \longrightarrow M$, and the identity section $i : M \hookrightarrow G$. The groupoid G acts on itself by left multiplication. This action leaves β invariant and interchanges leaves of the foliation $G^{\alpha} = \{\alpha^{-1}(x) : x \in M\}$, hence it induces an action on the distribution tangent to that foliation

$$\mathbb{T}^{\alpha}G := \ker \mathbb{T}\alpha \subset \mathbb{T}G.$$

In the space of sections $\Gamma(\mathbb{T}^{\alpha}G)$ we may distinguish $\chi_L(G)$ - the class of fields invariant with respect to the action. Clearly $\chi_L(G)$ is closed with respect to the Lie bracket on G , hence forms a Lie algebra. Moreover, every element of $\chi_L(G)$ is uniquely determined by its value along the identity section $i : M \hookrightarrow G$, thus we have an identification

$$\chi_L(G) \approx \Gamma(E), \text{ where } E = \mathbb{T}^{\alpha}G|_{i(M)}.$$

The subbundle E is a vector bundle with base M . Its space of sections $\Gamma(E)$ inherits the Lie bracket from $\chi_L(G)$. This bracket, together with ρ - the restriction of $\mathbb{T}\beta : \mathbb{T}G \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}M$ to E , gives a Lie algebroid structure on E . We have thus described the structure of a *Lie algebroid associated with a Lie groupoid* G . The situation we deal with is similar to the case of a Lie group. The left action of G allows us to identify $\mathbb{T}_g^{\alpha}G := \mathbb{T}^{\alpha}G \cap \mathbb{T}_gG$ with $E_{\beta(g)}$ via the map g_* for every $g \in G$. Reduction is hence an isomorphism $(g^{-1})_* : \mathbb{T}_g^{\alpha}G \longrightarrow E_{\beta(g)}$.

Let $g(t)$ be a C^1 curve which lies in a single leaf N of the foliation G^{α} . Denote $x(t) = \beta(g(t))$. The reduction procedure applied to $\dot{g}(t)$ gives rise to a path $a(t)$ in E covering $x(t)$

$$a(t) = g^{-1}(t)_* \dot{g}(t).$$

Observe that the path a satisfies the admissibility condition: $\rho(a(t)) = \dot{x}(t)$. Note also that, since g was of class C^1 , the path a is in general only continuous (of class C^0).

Consider now a homotopy (that is a one-parameter family) $g_{\varepsilon}(t)$ of curves in N . Assume that $g(t, \varepsilon) := g_{\varepsilon}(t)$ is of class C^1 with respect to both variables, and denote $x(t, \varepsilon) = \beta(g(t, \varepsilon))$. Clearly, the reduction procedure described above leads to a one-parameter family of E -paths $t \mapsto a(t, \varepsilon)$ covering $x(t, \varepsilon)$. On the other hand, the reduction with respect to parameter ε produces another one-parameter family of E -paths over $x(t, \varepsilon)$,

$$\varepsilon \mapsto b(t, \varepsilon) = g^{-1}(t, \varepsilon)_* \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} g(t, \varepsilon).$$

Clearly, a has an interpretation of the reduction of the homotopy g to E , and b is a reduction of the infinitesimal homotopy of g to E . Our goal now will be to describe the relation between a and b . For, we will use local coordinate charts.

Let (y^i) be local coordinates on N and (x^a) on M . The adapted coordinates on $\mathbb{T}N$ and $\mathbb{T}M$ are $(y^i, \dot{y}^j)$ and $(x^a, \dot{x}^b)$ respectively. Let $(e_1, \dots, e_m)$ be a basis of local sections on E . We have induced coordinate system (x^a, ξ^i) on E . Denote by $\rho_i^a(x)$, $c_{jk}^i(x)$ the coefficients of the anchor and the bracket in this coordinates, $\rho(e_i) = \rho_i^a(x)\partial_{x^a}$, $[e_j, e_k] = c_{jk}^i(x)e_i$. The reduction map $(g^{-1})_* : \mathbb{T}_g N \longrightarrow E_{\beta(g)}$ establishes the relation between coordinates in $\mathbb{T}N$ and E

$$\begin{aligned} x^a &= z^a(y), \\ \xi^i &= F_l^i(y)\dot{y}^l. \end{aligned}$$

Denote by $(f_j^i(y))$ the inverse matrix of $(F_j^i(y))$. Clearly, if $x^a = z^a(y)$, then $\rho_i^a(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y^i} z^a(y)$ and

$$c_{jk}^i(x) = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^m} F_l^i(y) - \frac{\partial}{\partial y^l} F_m^i(y) \right) f_j^l(y) f_k^m(y).$$

Let now $y^i(t, \varepsilon)$ be a homotopy in N . In local coordinates a and b read

$$\begin{aligned} a^i(t, \varepsilon) &= F_l^i(y) \partial_t y^l, \\ b^i(t, \varepsilon) &= F_l^i(y) \partial_\varepsilon y^l. \end{aligned}$$

Assume for a moment that $y^i(t, \varepsilon)$ is of class C^2 with respect to both variables. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t b^i - \partial_\varepsilon a^i &= \left(F_l^i(y) \partial_t \partial_\varepsilon y^l + \frac{\partial}{\partial y^m} F_l^i(y) \partial_t y^m \partial_\varepsilon y^l \right) - \left(F_l^i(y) \partial_\varepsilon \partial_t y^l + \frac{\partial}{\partial y^m} F_l^i(y) \partial_\varepsilon y^m \partial_t y^l \right) = \\ &= \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^m} F_l^i(y) - \frac{\partial}{\partial y^l} F_m^i(y) \right) \partial_t y^m \partial_\varepsilon y^l = \\ &= \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y^m} F_l^i(y) - \frac{\partial}{\partial y^l} F_m^i(y) \right) f_j^l(y) f_k^m(y) (F_s^j(y) \partial_\varepsilon y^s) (F_p^k(y) \partial_t y^p) = c_{jk}^i(x) b^j a^k. \end{aligned}$$

In consequence, we know that when the homotopy in G is of class C^2 , then a and b are related by the differential equation

$$\partial_t b^i = \partial_\varepsilon a^i + c_{jk}^i(x) b^j a^k. \quad (14)$$

In general, when $y^i(t, \varepsilon)$ is only of class C^1 , the functions a^i and b^i are only continuous and equation (14) makes no sense. It turns out, however, that $b^i(t, \varepsilon) = F_l^i(y) \partial_\varepsilon y^l$ is the unique continuous function being the weak solution of (14) with initial condition $b^i(0, \varepsilon) = F_l^i(y) \partial_\varepsilon y^l(0, \varepsilon)$. That is

$$\int_{I^2} -\partial_t \phi_i b^i dt d\varepsilon = \int_{I^2} -\partial_\varepsilon \phi_i a^i + \phi_i c_{jk}^i(x) b^j a^k dt d\varepsilon, \quad (15)$$

for every family of functions $\phi_i : I^2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of class $C_0^1(I^2)$.

Indeed, after short calculations one can see that the above condition is equivalent to

$$\int_{I^2} \partial_\varepsilon y^l \partial_t (\phi_i F_l^i(y)) dt d\varepsilon = \int_{I^2} \partial_t y^l \partial_\varepsilon (\phi_i F_l^i(y)) dt d\varepsilon. \quad (16)$$

Since $y^l(t, \varepsilon)$ is a true homotopy in N we have

$$\int_{I^2} \partial_\varepsilon y^l \partial_t \psi_l dt d\varepsilon = \int_{I^2} \partial_t y^l \partial_\varepsilon \psi_l dt d\varepsilon,$$

for every family of function $\psi_l \in C_0^\infty(I^2)$. Every function of class $C_0^1(I^2)$ can be approximated in C^1 norm by functions from C_0^∞ , hence the above equation holds true also for $\psi_l = \phi_i F_l^i(y)$. We have proved that b satisfies (15). The uniqueness of this weak solution will be proved later in this section in a more general setting. $\square$

The above considerations motivate the definition of the homotopy on a general algebroid E .

Definition 4.1. The pair of continuous maps $(a, b) : [t_0, t_1] \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow E \times E$, covering the same C^1 -map $x : [t_0, t_1] \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow M$, will be called *E-homotopy* if

1. For every t and ε we have $\sigma(a(t, \varepsilon)) = \partial_t x(t, \varepsilon)$ and $\rho(b(t, \varepsilon)) = \partial_\varepsilon x(t, \varepsilon)$ (that is a is the family of t -admissible paths (with respect to the anchor σ) and b the family of ε -admissible paths (with respect to ρ));
2. Let $a = (x^a, a^i)$ and $b = (x^a, b^i)$ in local coordinates on E . Then b^i is a weak solution of the differential equation

$$\partial_t b^i = \partial_\varepsilon a^i + c_{jk}^i(x) b^j a^k, \quad (17)$$

that is

$$\int_{I^2} -\partial_t \phi_i b^i dt d\varepsilon = \int_{I^2} -\partial_\varepsilon \phi_i a^i + \phi_i c_{jk}^i(x) b^j a^k dt d\varepsilon, \quad (18)$$

for every family of functions $\phi_i : I^2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of class $C_0^1(I^2)$.

The map $b : [t_0, t_1] \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow E$ will be called *infinitesimal E-homotopy* and the E -paths $b(t_0, \varepsilon)$ and $b(t_1, \varepsilon)$ the *initial* and the *final infinitesimal E-homotopies*. We will say that (a, b) is a *E-homotopy with fixed end-points* if the initial and the final infinitesimal E -homotopies are null paths.

We shall now show that the above definition has an invariant geometric meaning.

In the regular case, when a and b are of class C^1 , we may speak of tangent prolongations $\mathbb{T}_\varepsilon a \in \mathbb{T}E$ and $\mathbb{T}_t b \in \mathbb{T}E$. In local coordinates $\mathbb{T}_\varepsilon a = (x^a, a^i, \partial_\varepsilon x^b, \partial_\varepsilon a^j)$ and $\mathbb{T}_t b = (x^a, b^i, \partial_t x^b, \partial_t b^j)$. In view of (7), the following can be directly checked.

Theorem 4.2. *For a and b of class C^1 , Equation (17) together with σ -admissibility of a and ρ -admissibility of b is equivalent to the geometric condition that vectors $\mathbb{T}_\varepsilon a$ and $\mathbb{T}_t b$ are related by $\kappa : \mathbb{T}E \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}E$. Of course in this case equations (17) and (18) are equivalent.*

If a and b are of class C^0 only, there is no sense speaking of their tangent prolongations. The left- and right-hand side of the equation (18) can be, however, described as follows.

Consider an arbitrary C^0 -section $\phi : I^2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^*E$ over $b : I^2 \longrightarrow E$, with the property that $\mathbb{T}^*\tau(\phi) : I^2 \longrightarrow E^*$ – its projection to E^* is a C^1 -section which vanishes on the boundary. In local coordinates $\phi = (x^a, b^i, p_b, \phi_j)$, where p_b is continuous and ϕ_j is of class $C_0^1(I^2)$. The ε -tangent prolongation $\mathbb{T}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{T}^*\tau(\psi)) = (x^a, \phi_i, \partial_\varepsilon x^b, \partial_\varepsilon \phi_j)$ and $\Delta(\phi) = (x^a, \phi_i, \rho_k^b(x) b^k, c_{ij}^k(x) b^i \phi_k + p_b \sigma_j^b(x))$ are two elements in $\mathbb{T}E^*$ over the same base point in E^* , which project to the same vector $(x^a, \partial_\varepsilon x^b) = (x^a, \rho_k^b(x) b^k)$ in $\mathbb{T}M$ (we use ε -admissibility of b with respect to ρ). Consequently, their difference $\Delta(\phi) - \mathbb{T}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{T}^*\tau(\phi)) = (x^a, \phi_i, 0, c_{ij}^k(x) b^i \phi_k - \partial_\varepsilon \phi_j + p_b \sigma_j^b(x))$ is a vertical vector and it can be regarded as an element $V(\Delta(\phi) - \mathbb{T}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{T}^*\tau(\phi)))$ of E^* . Evaluating this element on $a \in E$ gives

$$\langle V(\Delta(\phi) - \mathbb{T}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{T}^*\tau(\phi))), a \rangle_\tau = \phi_k c_{ij}^k b^i a^j - \partial_\varepsilon \phi_j a^j + p_b \sigma_j^b(x) a^j.$$

On the other hand, we can pair elements $\mathcal{R}_\tau(\phi) = (x^a, \phi_i, -p_b, b^j) \in \mathbb{T}^*E^*$ and $-\mathbb{T}_t(\mathbb{T}^*\tau(\psi)) = (x^a, \phi_i, -\partial_t x^b, -\partial_t \phi_j) \in \mathbb{T}E^*$. The result is

$$\langle \mathcal{R}_\tau(\phi), -\mathbb{T}_t(\mathbb{T}^*\tau(\phi)) \rangle_{\tau E^*} = -\partial_t \phi_j b^j + p_b \partial_t x^b.$$

Note that $p_b \partial_t x^b = p_b \sigma_j^b(x) a^j$, since a is t -admissible with respect to σ . Thus we get the following.

Theorem 4.3. *The equation in local coordinates (18) is equivalent to*

$$\int_{I^2} \langle \mathcal{R}_\tau(\phi), -\mathbb{T}_t(\mathbb{T}^*\tau(\phi)) \rangle_{\tau E^*} dt d\varepsilon = \int_{I^2} \langle V(\Delta(\phi) - \mathbb{T}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{T}^*\tau(\phi))), a \rangle_\tau dt d\varepsilon,$$

for every section $\phi : I^2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}^*E$ from the considered class. It has therefore unambiguous geometric meaning independent on the choice of local coordinates.

In control theory curves which are continuous and piecewise C^1 appear in a natural way. Every such a curve can be regarded as a composition of several C^1 curves. This motivates natural definitions of compositions of E -paths and E -homotopies.

Definition 4.4. Let $a : [t_0, t_1] \longrightarrow E$ and $\bar{a} : [\bar{t}_0, \bar{t}_1] \longrightarrow E$ be two E -paths (with respect to σ or ρ) over x and $\bar{x}$ respectively. Assume that $x(t_1) = \bar{x}(\bar{t}_0)$. We define the *composition of E -paths*:

$$(a \circ \bar{a})(t) = \begin{cases} a(t) & \text{for } t \in [t_0, t_1] \\ \bar{a}(t - t_1 + \bar{t}_0) & \text{for } t \in [t_1, t_1 - \bar{t}_0 + \bar{t}_1]. \end{cases}$$

Observe that the path $a \circ \bar{a}$ is in general piecewise continuous, while its base path $x \circ \bar{x}$ is continuous and piecewise C^1 . From now on, by an E -path we will understand a composition of finite number of E -paths in the above sense.

Definition 4.5. Let $(a, b) : [t_0, t_1] \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow E^2$ and $(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) : [\bar{t}_0, \bar{t}_1] \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow E^2$ be two E -homotopies over x and $\bar{x}$ respectively. Assume that the final infinitesimal E -homotopy for (a, b) is equal to the initial infinitesimal E -homotopy for $(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ that is $b(t_1, \varepsilon) = \bar{b}(\bar{t}_0, \varepsilon)$ for every ε (in particular $x(t_1, \varepsilon) = \bar{x}(\bar{t}_0, \varepsilon)$, hence a and $\bar{a}$ are composable). We define the *composition of E -homotopies* $(a, b) \circ (\bar{a}, \bar{b}) = (a \circ \bar{a}, \tilde{b})$, where

$$\tilde{b}(t) = \begin{cases} b(t) & \text{for } t \in [t_0, t_1] \\ \bar{b}(t - t_1 + \bar{t}_0) & \text{for } t \in [t_1, t_1 - \bar{t}_0 + \bar{t}_1]. \end{cases}$$

Naturally, $\tilde{b}(t_0, \varepsilon) = b(t_0, \varepsilon)$ will be called the *initial* and $\tilde{b}(t_1 - \bar{t}_0 + \bar{t}_1, \varepsilon) = \bar{b}(\bar{t}_1, \varepsilon)$ the *final infinitesimal E -homotopy* for $a \circ \bar{a}$.

Again we will extend our understanding of the term E -homotopy to the composition of finitely many E -homotopies in the former sense.

Definition 4.6. We will say that two E -paths (with respect to σ) $a_0, a_1 : [t_0, t_1] \longrightarrow E$ are *equivalent* (and write $a_0 \sim a_1$), if there exists an E -homotopy with fixed end-points $(a, b) : [t_0, t_1] \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow E^2$ such that $a_0(t) = a(t, 0)$ and $a_1(t) = a(t, 1)$. Relation $\sim$ is clearly equivalence relation in the space of E -paths with respect to σ . Its classes will be denoted by $[a]$ or $[a(t)]_{t \in [t_0, t_1]}$. Clearly, if a_0 and $\bar{a}_0$ are composable and they are equivalent to a_1 and $\bar{a}_1$ respectively, then a_1 and $\bar{a}_1$ are also composable and $[a_0 \circ \bar{a}_0] = [a_1 \circ \bar{a}_1]$.

Remark 4.7. So far we have no tool to compare two E -paths parameterized by two different time intervals. This can be done by extending the equivalence relation $\sim$. We will add a (natural) condition that the composition with a null curve does not change the equivalence class: $[a \circ 0] = [a]$.

Now we shall discuss some basic, but important, properties of E -homotopies. By the way we will see under which additional assumptions made on the structure of an algebroid E the E -homotopies behave well. This will lead to the concept of AL algebroid.

Lemma 4.8 (Generating E -homotopies). *Let E be an algebroid. Take a one-parameter family of E -paths (with respect to σ) $a : [t_0, t_1] \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow E$, covering $x : [t_0, t_1] \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow M$. We will assume that $a(t, \varepsilon)$ is piecewise continuous with respect to t and of class C^1 with respect to ε and that $x(t, \varepsilon)$ is continuous and piecewise C^1 with respect to t and of class C^1 with respect to ε . Let $b_0(\varepsilon)$ be an arbitrary continuous E -path with respect to ρ covering $x(t_0, \varepsilon)$.*

There exists an unique E -homotopy (a, b) such that $b_0(\varepsilon)$ is its initial infinitesimal E -homotopy (for every choice of a) if and only if E has an unique anchor $\rho = \sigma$ which is an algebroid morphism (i.e. $\rho([X, Y]_E) = [\rho(X), \rho(Y)]_{\text{TM}}$).

Proof. By definition, the infinitesimal E -homotopy $b(t, \varepsilon)$ if exists should be the solution of the differential equation, which in local coordinates reads

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t b^i(t, \varepsilon) = \partial_\varepsilon a^i(t, \varepsilon) + c_{jk}^i(x(t, \varepsilon)) b^j(t, \varepsilon) a^k(t, \varepsilon), \\ b^i(t_0, \varepsilon) = b_0^i(\varepsilon). \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Since $\partial_\varepsilon a(t, \varepsilon)$ is well defined, there is no need speaking of the weak solutions. The above equation is an ordinary affine differential equation with respect to t with a parameter ε . The general theory of ODE's guarantees that it has the unique solution $b(t, \varepsilon)$ continuous with respect to ε . To prove that (a, b) is indeed an E -homotopy it is enough to show that $\varepsilon \mapsto b(t, \varepsilon)$ is ρ -admissible for every fixed t .

Consider a function

$$\chi^a(t, \varepsilon) := \partial_\varepsilon x^a(t, \varepsilon) - \rho_i^a(x(t, \varepsilon)) b^i(t, \varepsilon).$$

We shall show that $\chi^a \equiv 0$.

Observe that since $a(t, \varepsilon)$ is the family of σ -admissible paths

$$\partial_t x^a(t, \varepsilon) = \sigma_k^a(x(t, \varepsilon)) a^k(t, \varepsilon). \quad (20)$$

The right-hand side of this equation is differentiable with respect to ε , hence so is the left-hand side and

$$\partial_\varepsilon \partial_t x^a(t, \varepsilon) = \partial_t \partial_\varepsilon x^a(t, \varepsilon) = \frac{\partial \sigma_k^a}{\partial x^b}(x(t, \varepsilon)) \partial_\varepsilon x^b(t, \varepsilon) a^k(t, \varepsilon) + \sigma_k^a(x(t, \varepsilon)) \partial_\varepsilon a^k(t, \varepsilon).$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \chi^a &= \partial_t \partial_\varepsilon x^a - \partial_t (\rho_k^a b^k) = \frac{\partial \sigma_k^a}{\partial x^b} \partial_\varepsilon x^b a^k + \sigma_k^a \partial_\varepsilon a^k - \frac{\partial \rho_i^a}{\partial x^b} \partial_t x^b b^i - \rho_i^a \partial_t b^i = \text{from (20) and (19)} \\ &= \frac{\partial \sigma_k^a}{\partial x^b} \partial_\varepsilon x^b a^k + \sigma_k^a \partial_\varepsilon a^k - \frac{\partial \rho_i^a}{\partial x^b} \sigma_k^b a^k b^i - \rho_i^a (\partial_\varepsilon a^i + c_{jk}^i b^j a^k) = \\ &= \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^b} \sigma_k^a \right) a^k \chi^b + (\sigma_k^a - \rho_k^a) \partial_\varepsilon a^k + \left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^b} \sigma_k^a \right) \rho_j^b - \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^b} \rho_j^a \right) \sigma_k^b - \rho_i^a c_{jk}^i \right] b^j a^k. \end{aligned}$$

We have an affine differential equation for χ_a with initial condition $\chi^a(t_0, \varepsilon) = 0$ (since $b_0(\varepsilon)$ is ρ -admissible). The solution is constantly 0 if and only if the last two terms in the above equation vanish. To guarantee it regardless of $a(t, \varepsilon)$ we have to assume that $\rho_k^a = \sigma_k^a$ (the anchor is unique) and it is an algebroid morphism

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^b} \sigma_k^a \right) \rho_j^b - \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^b} \rho_j^a \right) \sigma_k^b = \rho_i^a c_{jk}^i.$$

□

It turns out that when an algebroid has a unique anchor being an algebroid morphism, the E -homotopies are true homotopies in the space of E -paths (i.e. one-parameter families of E -paths). This has been already observed in [12, Theorem 3] in a slightly different form. From now on we will speak only of algebroids satisfying this conditions (hence we can forget about distinguishing E -admissibility with respect to ρ and σ).

The next lemma states that shrinking an E -path to its initial (or final) point is an E -homotopy provided that E is AL algebroid.

Lemma 4.9 (Shrinking a curve). *Let $a : [0, 1] \longrightarrow E$ be an E -path. Define $\bar{a}(t, \varepsilon) = \varepsilon a(t\varepsilon)$, $\bar{b}(t, \varepsilon) = ta(t\varepsilon)$. The pair $(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ is an E -homotopy (for every choice of a) if and only if E has a skew anchor. The initial infinitesimal E -homotopy is equal to 0 and final to a .*

Similarly, consider $\tilde{a}(t, \varepsilon) = (1 - \varepsilon)a(1 - (1 - t)(1 - \varepsilon))$, $\tilde{b}(t, \varepsilon) = (1 - t)a(1 - (1 - t)(1 - \varepsilon))$. The pair $(\tilde{a}, \tilde{b})$ is again an E -homotopy whose initial infinitesimal E -homotopy is equal to a and final to 0.

Proof. First of all check that $t \mapsto \varepsilon a(t\varepsilon)$ and $\varepsilon \mapsto ta(t\varepsilon)$ are E -paths. Since $\dot{x}(t) = \rho(a(t))$, clearly $\partial_t(x(\varepsilon t)) = \varepsilon \dot{x}(t\varepsilon) = \varepsilon \rho(a(t\varepsilon)) = \rho(\varepsilon a(t\varepsilon))$. The same calculation holds for $\bar{b}(t, \varepsilon)$.

Denote by $A^i(s)$ the integral of $a^i(s)$. For every $\phi_i \in C_0^\infty(I^2)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I^2} \partial_\varepsilon \phi_i \varepsilon a^i(t\varepsilon) dt d\varepsilon &= \int_{I^2} \partial_\varepsilon \phi_i \partial_t A^i(t\varepsilon) dt d\varepsilon = \\ &= - \int_{I^2} \partial_t \partial_\varepsilon \phi_i A^i(t\varepsilon) dt d\varepsilon + \int_I \left(\partial_\varepsilon \phi_i(1, \varepsilon) A^i(\varepsilon) - \partial_\varepsilon \phi_i(0, \varepsilon) A^i(0) \right) d\varepsilon = \\ &= - \int_{I^2} \partial_\varepsilon \partial_t \phi_i A^i(t\varepsilon) dt d\varepsilon + \int_I (0 - 0) d\varepsilon = \int_{I^2} \partial_t \phi_i ta^i(t\varepsilon) dt d\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since every function in $C_0^1(I^2)$ can be approximated in C^1 norm by $C_0^\infty(I^2)$, we have for every $\phi_i \in C_0^1(I^2)$

$$\int_{I^2} \partial_\varepsilon \phi_i \varepsilon a^i(t\varepsilon) dt d\varepsilon = \int_{I^2} \partial_t \phi_i ta^i(t\varepsilon) dt d\varepsilon.$$

We see that the pair $(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ satisfies the weak equation

$$\partial_t \bar{b}^i = \partial_\varepsilon \bar{a}^i$$

The latter equals $\partial_\varepsilon \bar{a}^i + c_{jk}^i \bar{b}^j \bar{a}^k = \partial_\varepsilon \bar{a}^i + t\varepsilon c_{jk}^i a^j(t\varepsilon) a^k(t\varepsilon)$ (hence is E -homotopy) regardless of a if and only iff the last term vanishes, hence the bracket is skew-symmetric.

The conclusion for $(\tilde{a}, \tilde{b})$ is proven analogously. $\square$

We see that E -homotopies satisfy the natural geometric properties discussed in lemmas 4.8 and 4.9 if the bracket is skew-symmetric (what implies unique anchor $\rho = \sigma$) and the anchor is an algebroid morphism. This is what we defined under the name *almost Lie algebroid* (AL algebroid). From now on we will assume that E is an AL algebroid.

The next result is a simple, but important consequence of lemma 4.9.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $(a, b) : [t_0, t_1] \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow E^2$ be an E -homotopy. Then,*

$$[a(_, 0) \circ b(t_1, _)] = [b(t_0, _) \circ a(_, 1)].$$

Proof. The first part of the lemma 4.9, applied to the curve $\varepsilon \mapsto b(t_0, \varepsilon)$, gives us the existence of E -homotopy $(c, d) : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow E^2$ such that $c(t, 0) = 0$, $c(t, 1) = b(t_0, t)$, $d(0, \varepsilon) = 0$ and $d(1, \varepsilon) = b(t_0, \varepsilon)$.

Similarly, using second part of lemma 4.9 for $\varepsilon \mapsto b(t_1, \varepsilon)$, we obtain an E -homotopy $(e, f) : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow E^2$ such that $e(t, 0) = b(t_1, t)$, $e(t, 1) = 0$, $f(0, \varepsilon) = b(t_1, \varepsilon)$, $f(1, \varepsilon) = 0$.

Clearly, E -homotopies (c, d) , (a, b) and (e, f) are composable and their composition is the E -homotopy with fixed end-points, which establishes the equivalence of E -paths $0 \circ a(_, 0) \circ b(t_1, _)$ and $b(t_0, _) \circ a(_, 1) \circ 0$. $\square$

Remark 4.11. The above lemma will be very useful, as it shows the connection between E -homotopies with and without fixed end-points. Consider E -homotopy $(a, b) : [t_0, t_1] \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow E^2$. If the initial infinitesimal E -homotopy $b(t_0, \varepsilon)$ is a null curve, in order to check that $[a(_, 0)] = [a(_, 1)]$ it is enough to check that $[b(t_1, _)] = 0$. Thus the problem of equivalence of $a(_, 0)$ and $a(_, 1)$ can be solved by investigating the final infinitesimal E -homotopy.

Next we shall show that every E -path can be considered as a path parameterized by the interval $[0, 1]$.

Lemma 4.12 (Reparameterization). *Let $a : [t_0, t_1] \longrightarrow E$ be an E -path and define $\bar{a}(t) := (t_1 - t_0)a(t_0 + (t - t_0)t)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. The classes $[a]$ and $[\bar{a}]$ are equal.*

Proof. Consider $\tilde{a}(t, \varepsilon) = \varepsilon a(t_0 + (t - t_0)\varepsilon)$ and $\tilde{b}(t, \varepsilon) = (t - t_0)a(t_0 + (t - t_0)\varepsilon)$. Analogously to the proof of lemma 4.9 one easily verifies that $(\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}) : [t_0, t_1] \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow E^2$ is an E -homotopy. The initial infinitesimal E -homotopy $\tilde{b}(t_0, \varepsilon)$ is a null curve and the final is $\tilde{b}(t_1, \varepsilon) = \bar{a}(\varepsilon)$. It follows from lemma 4.10 that:

$$[0 \circ \bar{a}] = [\tilde{a}(_, 0) \circ \tilde{b}(t_1, _)] = [\tilde{b}(t_0, _) \circ \tilde{a}(_, 1)] = [0 \circ a].$$

□

At the end of this section we will give results concerning existence and uniqueness of E -homotopies.

Lemma 4.13 (Uniqueness of E -homotopies). *For every continuous family of t -admissible paths $a(t, \varepsilon)$ over $x(t, \varepsilon)$ and for every E -path $b_0(\varepsilon)$ over $x(t_0, \varepsilon)$, there exist at most one continuous family of ε -admissible paths $b(t, \varepsilon)$, such that (a, b) is an E -homotopy and $b_0(\varepsilon)$ is its initial infinitesimal E -homotopy (i.e. $b_0(\varepsilon) = b(t_0, \varepsilon)$).*

Proof. Let b^i and $\bar{b}^i$ be two continuous functions being two weak solutions of (18) with the same initial condition. The difference $\delta b^i := b^i - \bar{b}^i$ satisfies

$$-\int_{I^2} \delta b^i \partial_t \phi_i dt d\varepsilon = \int_{I^2} c_{jk}^i \delta b^j a^k \phi_i dt d\varepsilon,$$

for every $\phi_i \in C_0^1(I^2)$. We see that δb^i is a weak solution of the linear differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f^i = c_{jk}^i a^k f^j, \\ f^i(0, \varepsilon) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Clearly $f^i \equiv 0$ is another solution of this equation. General theory of linear ODE's gives us the uniqueness of this solution (precise argument can be given by Dubois-Reymond Lemma), hence $\delta b^i \equiv 0$ □

5 Control systems on AL algebroids.

A classical control system is a differential equation on a manifold M dependent on a control parameter u which takes values in some topological space U . This can be realized by a continuous map $f : M \times U \longrightarrow TM$, such that $f(\cdot, u)$ is a section of TM for each $u \in U$. Our motivation to introduce control system on an almost Lie algebroid comes, of course, from the reduction procedure. Clearly, if $\tilde{f} : G \times U \longrightarrow T^\alpha G \subset TG$ is a control system on a Lie groupoid G , equivariant with respect to the left action of G on G and $T^\alpha G$, it reduces to a continuous map $f : M \times U \longrightarrow E$ taking values in E – the Lie algebroid of left invariant vector fields of G . In this situation $f(\cdot, u)$ is a section of the bundle E . This motivates the following definition.

Definition 5.1. A *control system* on an almost Lie algebroid E is a continuous map

$$f : M \times U \longrightarrow E. \tag{21}$$

We will assume that U is a Hausdorff topological space and that $f_u := f(\cdot, u)$ is a C^1 -section of E for each $u \in U$.

Fixing a function $u : [t_0, t_1] \longrightarrow U$ (here $[t_0, t_1]$ is an arbitrary interval) and initial point x_0 , one will obtain a differential equation on M

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = \rho(f(x(t), u(t))), \\ x(t_0) = x_0. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

We will consider only functions u which are piecewise continuous (that is, u has finitely many points of discontinuity and possesses one-sided limits at every such point). Such u 's will be called *admissible controls*.

Basic properties of ODEs guarantee that for every admissible control u there exists (at least locally) $x(t)$ – the unique solution of the differential equation (22) which is continuous and piecewise C^1 . Note that if $x(t)$ is the solution of (22), then $a(t) = f(x(t), u(t))$ is an E -path over $x(t)$. This E -path will be called the *trajectory* of the control system associated with the admissible control $u(t)$.

Another important concept in control theory is a *cost function* $L : M \times U \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We will assume the same regularity conditions as in case of the control function, namely that L is a continuous function which is of class C^1 with respect to the first variable. If now $x(t)$ is a solution of the system (22) for some admissible control $u : [t_0, t_1] \longrightarrow U$, we define the *total cost* of this solution to be

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_1} L(x(t), u(t)) dt.$$

(Note that since L is continuous, $u(t)$ piecewise continuous and the interval $[t_0, t_1]$ compact, the above integral is finite whenever the solution $x(t)$ exists).

Our next goal is to formulate the optimal control problem for a system (21) with the cost function L . Clearly, we should minimize the total cost integral $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} L(x(t), u(t)) dt$ for some class of solutions of the system (21). In classical control theory (with $E = TM$) one often considers the problem of finding a curve $x(t)$ joining two fixed points x_0 and x_1 on a manifold M . It is not completely clear how should we substitute the fixed-end-points condition when working on an algebroid E . In order to motivate the definition one should again look at the reduction procedure. We start from a G -equivariant control system on Lie groupoid G and consider only solutions joining two fixed points g_0 and g_1 (note that they both should lie in a single leaf N of a foliation G^α). If N is simply-connected, the homotopy classes of curves in N are determined by the end-points. As we already know, C^1 -homotopies on G reduce to E -homotopies. Hence, in an optimal control problem on an AL algebroid one should compare the equivalence classes of trajectories.

Definition 5.2. Consider a control system (21) on E with cost function L . Fix an equivalence class $[\sigma]$ of E -path σ with initial base-point x_0 . We will understand an *optimal control problem on E* as follows. Find an admissible control $u : [t_0, t_1] \longrightarrow U$ (the interval $I = [t_0, t_1]$ is to be found as well) such that:

- (a) the admissible path $f(x(t), u(t))$ in E induced by $u(t)$ belongs to the homotopy class $[\sigma]$;
- (b) the total cost $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} L(x(t), u(t)) dt$ is minimal among admissible controls satisfying (a).

(Here $x(t)$ is the solution of the equation (22) with the initial condition $x(t_0) = x_0$).

Before we proceed to the formulation of a generalization of the Maximum Principle, we will consider two important aspects of control systems on Lie algebroids. The first one is passing to the product algebroid $T\mathbb{R} \times E$ which will allow us to treat both the control and the cost functions in the same manner. The second is the possibility of generating E -homotopies with a help of the

control system.

Denote by $\mathbf{A}$ the product algebroid $\mathbb{T}\mathbb{R} \times E$ over $\mathbb{R} \times M$ ($\mathbb{T}\mathbb{R}$ is a tangent bundle of the real line with the standard Lie algebroid structure). The canonical projections $p_E : \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow E$ and $p_{\mathbb{R}} : \mathbf{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}\mathbb{R}$ are algebroid morphisms and they map admissible paths into admissible ones. We will consequently, to the end of this paper, use bold letters to emphasize objects associated with $\mathbf{A}$, for instance: $\mathbf{x} = (x^0, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times M$ and $\mathbf{a} = (a^0, a) \in \mathbb{T}\mathbb{R} \times E$.

Fix an admissible control $u : [t_0, t_1] \longrightarrow U$. We may consider the differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}^0(t) = L(x(t), u(t)), \\ \dot{x}(t) = \rho(f(x(t), u(t))), \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

with the initial conditions $x^0(t_0) = 0$ and $x(t_0) = x_0$. Clearly, the above equation can be considered as the differential equation associated with a control system on the algebroid $\mathbf{A}$

$$\mathbf{f} = (f^0, \tilde{f}) : (\mathbb{R} \times M) \times U \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}\mathbb{R} \times E = \mathbf{A}, \quad (24)$$

where $f^0(x^0, x, u) = (x^0, L(x, u)) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{T}\mathbb{R}$ and $\tilde{f}(x^0, x, u) = f(x, u)$. (Observe that the dependence of $\mathbf{f}$ on x_0 is trivial). Note that $x^0(t_1) = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} (x(t), u(t)) dt$, hence the system (24) contains the information on both: the system (21) on E and the cost function L .

Remark 5.3. We can now reformulate the optimal control problem on E in terms of (24) as follows. Find an admissible control $u : I = [t_0, t_1] \longrightarrow U$ such that:

- (a) the admissible path $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t))$ in $\mathbf{A}$ induced by $u(t)$ projects to the homotopy class $[\sigma]$ in E ;
- (b) the total cost $x^0(t_1)$ is minimal among admissible controls satisfying (a).

(Here $\mathbf{x}(t) = (x^0(t), x(t))$ is the solution of the equation (23) with the initial condition $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = (0, x_0)$).

As has been observed in [9] E -homotopy can be generated by a time-dependent section on E . Since the control system (22) is a family of E -sections f_u , fixing admissible control $u(t)$ produces a time-dependent family of sections $f_{u(t)}$. The associated E -homotopy is well understood in terms of lemma 4.8. Indeed, solving equation (22) for a one-parameter family of initial conditions $x_0(\varepsilon)$ (denote such solution by $x(t, \varepsilon)$) one obtains a one-parameter family of E -paths

$$a(t, \varepsilon) := f(x(t, \varepsilon), u(t)).$$

It is a student ODE's-theory exercise to show that if the solution $x(t)$ is defined for $t \in [t_0, t_1]$, so are the solutions $x(t, \varepsilon)$ (at least for $x_0(\varepsilon)$'s close enough to x_0). Moreover, the dependence on the initial condition is smooth. Lemma 4.8 guarantees that, given a continuous E -path $b_0(\varepsilon)$ over $x(t_0, \varepsilon)$, there exists a map $b(t, \varepsilon)$ such that (a, b) is the E -homotopy with initial infinitesimal E -homotopy $b_0(\varepsilon)$. In local coordinates on E $b(t, \varepsilon) = (x^a(t, \varepsilon), b^i(t, \varepsilon))$ is the solution of the differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t b^i(t, \varepsilon) = \frac{\partial f^i}{\partial x^a}(x(t, \varepsilon), u(t)) \rho_k^a(x(t, \varepsilon)) b^k(t, \varepsilon) + c_{jk}^i(x(t, \varepsilon)) b^j(t, \varepsilon) f^k(x(t, \varepsilon), u(t)), \\ \partial_t x^a(t, \varepsilon) = \rho_i^a(x(t, \varepsilon)) f^i(x(t, \varepsilon), u(t)), \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

with initial conditions $b^i(t_0, \varepsilon) = b_0^i(\varepsilon)$ and $x^a(t_0, \varepsilon) = x_0^a(\varepsilon)$. The t -evolution of $b(t, \varepsilon)$ can be described in terms of tools introduced in section 3. For every $u \in U$ we may lift the section f_u of

E to the linear vector field $d_{\mathbb{T}}^{\Delta}(f_u)$ on E . Evaluating it on $u(t)$ gives the time-dependent family of vector fields $d_{\mathbb{T}}^{\Delta}(f_{u(t)})$ on E . In local coordinates on TE

$$d_{\mathbb{T}}^{\Delta}(x, y) = \left(x^a, y^i, \rho_j^b(x) f^j(x, u(t)), \frac{\partial f^j}{\partial x^a}(x, u(t)) \rho_k^a(x) y^k + c_{ik}^j(x) y^i f^k(x, u(t)) \right).$$

Clearly, equation (25) describes the evolution along this field.

On the other side of the picture, with the family of section $f_u(t)$ we may associate a family of linear functions $h_t(\xi) := \langle f(\pi(\xi), u(t)), \xi \rangle_{\tau}$ on E^* . It defines the family of Hamiltonian vector fields $\mathcal{X}_{h_t}$ on E^* . In local coordinates on $\mathbb{T}E^*$

$$\mathcal{X}_{h_t}(x, \xi) = \left(x^a, \xi_i, \rho_j^b(x) f^j(x, u(t)), c_{ij}^k(x) f^i(x, u(t)) \xi_k - \rho_j^a(x) \frac{\partial f^i}{\partial x^a}(x, u(t)) \xi_i \right).$$

We have thus introduced two time-dependent vector fields $d_{\mathbb{T}}^{\Delta}(f_{u(t)})$ on E and $\mathcal{X}_{h_t}$ on E^* . Note that both fields give the same base evolution which is precisely defined by equation (22).

Definition 5.4. The flows of the above fields will be called *operators of parallel transport* along the solution $x(t)$ of the system (21). We will denote them by B_{ts} and $\overline{B}_{ts}$ respectively. The analogous operators associated with the control system (24) will be denoted by $\mathbf{B}_{ts}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{B}}_{ts}$.

Lemma 5.5. Operators B and $\overline{B}$ have the property of preserving the pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\tau}$, that is

$$\langle B_{tt_0}(y), \overline{B}_{tt_0}(\xi) \rangle_{\tau} = \langle y, \xi \rangle_{\tau},$$

for every $y \in E$ and $\xi \in E^*$ over the same base point in M .

Proof. Since B and $\overline{B}$ are the flows of fields $d_{\mathbb{T}}^{\Delta}(f_{u(t)})$ and $\mathcal{X}_{h_t}$ it is enough to show that

$$\langle d_{\mathbb{T}}^{\Delta}(f_{u(t)}), \mathcal{X}_{h_t} \rangle_{\mathbb{T}\tau} = 0.$$

This, in turn, can be seen by explicit coordinate calculation. The skew symmetry of $c_{jk}^i(x)$ is used. $\square$

At the end of this section observe that the Hamiltonian evolution on $\mathbf{A}^* = \mathbb{T}^*\mathbb{R} \times E^*$ associated with the control system (24) is trivial on the $\mathbb{T}^*\mathbb{R}$ -component. Indeed, it is straightforward to verify that $\mathbf{z}(t) = (z_0(t), z(t)) = \overline{\mathbf{B}}_{tt_0}(\mathbf{z}(t_0))$ evolves due to equations

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t z_k(t) = -\rho_k^{\alpha}(x(t)) \left(\frac{\partial f^i}{\partial x^{\alpha}}(x(t), u(t)) z_i(t) + \frac{\partial L}{\partial x^{\alpha}}(x(t), u(t)) z_0 \right) + c_{jk}^i(x(t)) f^j(x(t), u(t)) z_i(t), \\ \partial_t z_0(t) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

6 The Maximum Principle.

Recall first what we understand by an optimal control problem on an AL-algebroid.

We consider the control system $f : M \times U \longrightarrow E$ with the cost function $L : M \times U \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on an AL-algebroid E . We look for an admissible control $u : [t_0, t_1] \longrightarrow U$ (the interval $[t_0, t_1]$ is not fixed), such that the associated trajectory $\rho(f(x(t), u(t)))$ belongs to a fixed E -homotopy class $[\sigma]$, and such that the total cost integral $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} L(x(t), u(t)) dt$ is minimal among all such controls. Here $x(t)$ is the solution of the differential equation $\dot{x}(t) = \rho(f(x(t), u(t)))$ with initial condition $x(t_0) = x_0$ – the initial base-point of σ .

Recall also that we have defined the map $\mathbf{f} = (f^0, \tilde{f}) : (\mathbb{R} \times M) \times U \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}\mathbb{R} \times E =: \mathbf{A}$. Here $f^0(x^0, x, u) = (x^0, L(x, u)) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} = \mathbb{T}\mathbb{R}$ and $\tilde{f}(x^0, x, u) = f(x, u)$.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $u : [t_0, t_1] \longrightarrow U$ be a solution of the optimal control problem. There exists a curve $\mathbf{z}(t) = (z_0(t), z(t)) : [t_0, t_1] \longrightarrow \mathbf{A}^*$ (with initial base-point $\mathbf{x}_0 = (0, x_0)$ and such that $z_0(t_1) < 0$) which satisfies the following conditions:*

- *the curve $\mathbf{z}(t)$ is a trajectory of the time-dependent family of Hamiltonian vector fields $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{H}_t}$ associated with the Hamiltonians $\mathbf{H}_t(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}, u(t))$, where*

$$\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}, u) = \langle \mathbf{f}(\pi(\mathbf{z}), u), \mathbf{z} \rangle_{\tau};$$

- *the pair $u(t)$ and $\mathbf{z}(t)$ satisfies the "Maximum Principle"*

$$\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), u(t)) = \sup_{v \in U} \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), v)$$

at every point of continuity of the control u ;

- *the covector $\mathbf{z}(t)$ is nowhere-vanishing;*
- *$\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), u(t)) = 0$ at every point of continuity of the control u .*

The above theorem is stated in terms of the algebroid $\mathbf{A}$ – which will be useful in the proof. It is equivalent to Theorem 1.1 stated in terms of the algebroid E . The equivalence of theorems 6.1 and 1.1 is clear. Since, the Hamiltonian evolution of $\mathbb{T}^*\mathbb{R}$ -component in $\mathbf{A}^*$ is trivial, the curve $\mathbf{z}(t)$ from theorem 6.1 equals $(z_0, z(t))$. The Hamiltonian evolution of $\mathbf{z}(t)$ in $\mathbf{A}^*$ associated with $\mathbf{H}_t$ project to the Hamiltonian evolution of $z(t)$ in E^* associated with H_t . $\square$

Proof. Starting from a solution of the optimal control problem $(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t))$, we will consider variations of the trajectory $\mathbf{a}(t) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t))$ in the form

$$\mathbf{a}_\varepsilon(t) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_\varepsilon(t), u_\varepsilon(t)),$$

where $u_\varepsilon(t)$ is a variation of the control. The problem is that at the same time we must fix the homotopy class $[\mathbf{a}_\varepsilon(t)]$. We will therefore consider $\mathbf{a}_\varepsilon$ as an $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopy with some infinitesimal $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopy $\mathbf{b}(t, \varepsilon)$. Due to lemma 4.10, in order to compare equivalence classes of $\mathbf{a}_\varepsilon$, it is enough to study $\mathbf{b}(t, \varepsilon)$. Of special interest will be the element $\mathbf{b}(t, 0) \in \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(t)}$ and, more generally, the set $\mathbf{K}_t \subset \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(t)}$ of all such elements obtained for different variations u_ε . The optimality of u will impose special geometrical conditions on $\mathbf{K}_t$, namely that $\mathbf{K}_t$ is a convex and proper subset of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(t)}$. Consequently, there exists a covector $\mathbf{z}(t) \in \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(t)}$ supporting $\mathbf{K}_t$. A similar strategy was used in [30] in the classical situation $E = \mathbb{T}M$.

We will start with introducing an ‘idle’ variation of a fixed admissible control $u : [t_0, t_1] \longrightarrow U$. Usually one understands a variation as a continuous deformation. In case of an admissible control, however, we must change this picture. Imagine, for instance, that U is a discrete set and u is constant on $[t_0, t_1]$. There is obviously no way of deforming u by a continuous deformation. Our goal is, however, not only to deform u , but to construct a corresponding family of trajectories of our control system. We expect that a small change of control will lead to a small change of the trajectory of the system. We will define a variation of the control u as a substitution of u by some value $v_i \in U$ on a small interval of length $\varepsilon \delta t_i$. We will also allow another operation on the control, namely, lengthening or shortening the time interval on which u is defined by a number $\varepsilon \delta t$. This is the idea standing behind the concept of the variation of the control. Here is a formal and rather technical definition.

Let $u : [t_0, t_1] \longrightarrow U$ be a fixed admissible control. Choose points $t_0 < \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq \dots \leq \tau_s \leq \tau < t_1$, which are the points of continuity of u . Next, choose non-negative numbers $\delta t_1, \dots, \delta t_s$ and an arbitrary real number δt . Finally, choose (not necessarily different) elements

$v_1, \dots, v_s \in U$. This whole set of data $(\tau_i, v_i, \tau, \delta t_i, \delta t)_{i=1, \dots, s}$ will be denoted by $\mathfrak{w}$, and called *the symbol of the variation*.

Next, we define half-open ε -dependent intervals I_i for $i = 1, \dots, s$. Take

$$l_i = \begin{cases} \delta t - (\delta t_1 + \dots + \delta t_s) & \text{when } \tau_i = \tau; \\ -(\delta t_1 + \dots + \delta t_s) & \text{when } \tau_i = \tau_s < \tau; \\ -(\delta t_i + \dots + \delta t_j) & \text{when } \tau_i = \tau_{i+1} = \dots = \tau_j < \tau_{j+1}, \end{cases}$$

and denote $I_i = (\tau_i + \varepsilon l_i, \tau_i + \varepsilon(l_i + \delta t_i)]$. As we see, the interval I_i is open from the left and closed from the right and it has length $\varepsilon \cdot \delta t_i$. If $\tau_i < \tau_{i+1}$ or $i = s$ and $\tau_s < \tau$ the end-point of I_i lies at τ_i . If $\tau_i = \tau_{i+1}$, the end point of I_i is at the beginning point of I_{i+1} . If $\tau_s = \tau$, we set the end point of I_s at $\tau + \varepsilon \delta t$. Clearly, for ε small enough intervals I_i lie inside $[t_0, t_1]$ and they are pairwise disconnected.

Definition 6.2. For $t \in [t_0, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]$ we define a new admissible control:

$$u_\varepsilon^\mathfrak{w}(t) = \begin{cases} v_i & \text{when } t \in I_i, \\ u(t) & \text{when } t \in [t_0, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t] - \bigcup_i I_i. \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

This one-parameter family of controls $u_\varepsilon^\mathfrak{w}$ will be called a *variation of the control u* associated with the symbol $\mathfrak{w}$.

Remark 6.3. Observe that, when $\delta t_i = 0$, the interval I_i is empty. Consequently, we can add points τ_i with arbitrary v_i and $\tau_i = 0$ to the symbol $\mathfrak{w}$ without changing the variation $u_\varepsilon^\mathfrak{w}$.

Fix a symbol $\mathfrak{w} = (\tau_i, v_i, \tau, \delta t_i, \delta t)_{i=1, \dots, s}$ and an admissible control u . Let θ be a number such that $u_\varepsilon^\mathfrak{w}$ is well defined for $\varepsilon \leq \theta$ (i.e. the intervals I_i are pairwise disconnected). We consider a family of trajectories of the control system (24) obtained for different admissible controls $u_\varepsilon^\mathfrak{w}$

$$\mathbf{a}(t, \varepsilon) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), u_\varepsilon^\mathfrak{w}(t)),$$

where $\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon)$ is the solution of the differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{x}}(t, \varepsilon) = \rho_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), u_\varepsilon^\mathfrak{w}(t))), \\ \mathbf{x}(t_0, \varepsilon) = \mathbf{x}_0(\varepsilon), \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

with $\mathbf{x}_0(\varepsilon)$ being an arbitrary C^1 -path in $\mathbb{R} \times M$. We will denote the unvariated trajectories by $\mathbf{a}(t) := \mathbf{a}(t, 0)$ and $\mathbf{x}(t) := \mathbf{x}(t, 0)$.

Lemma 6.4. *Let $\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon)$ be any continuous $\mathbf{A}$ -path covering $\mathbf{x}_0(\varepsilon)$. There exists $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopy $(\bar{\mathbf{a}}(t, \varepsilon), \bar{\mathbf{b}}(t, \varepsilon))$, for $t \in [\bar{t}_0, \bar{t}_1]$ and $\varepsilon \in [0, \theta]$, such that its initial infinitesimal $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopy is $\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon)$, and for every $\varepsilon \leq \theta$ we have the equivalence $[\mathbf{a}(t, \varepsilon)_{t \in [t_0, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]}] = [\bar{\mathbf{a}}(t, \varepsilon)_{t \in [\bar{t}_0, \bar{t}_1]}]$. Moreover, the final infinitesimal homotopy $\bar{\mathbf{b}}(\bar{t}_1, s) =: \mathbf{d}^\mathfrak{w}(s)$ satisfies*

$$[\mathbf{c}(s)_{s \in [0, \varepsilon]}][\mathbf{a}(t, \varepsilon)_{t \in [t_0, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]}] = [\mathbf{a}(t)_{t \in [t_0, \tau]}][\mathbf{d}^\mathfrak{w}(s)_{s \in [0, \varepsilon]}], \quad (29)$$

and

$$\mathbf{d}^\mathfrak{w}(0) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau), u(\tau))\delta t + \mathbf{B}_{\tau t_0}(\mathbf{c}(0)) + \sum_{i=1}^s \mathbf{B}_{\tau \tau_i}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), v_i) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), u(\tau_i))]\delta t_i \in \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)}. \quad (30)$$

The proof is rather long and we postpone it to section 7.1.

Motivated by the above result we define

$$\mathbf{K}_\tau^u := \text{cl}\{\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau), u(\tau))\delta t + \sum_{i=1}^s \mathbf{B}_{\tau\tau_i} \left[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), v_i) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), u(\tau_i)) \right] \delta t_i : (\tau_i, v_i, \tau, \delta t_i, \delta t)_{i=1, \dots, s} \text{ is a symbol}\}.$$

The set $\mathbf{K}_\tau^u$ can be understood as the set of all directions in $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)}$ in which one can move the point $\mathbf{x}(\tau)$ by performing variations of control of the form $u_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{w}}$ without changing $\mathbf{x}_0$ – the initial base point of the trajectory. The geometry of $\mathbf{K}_\tau^u$ will be the object of our interests.

Lemma 6.5. *The set $\mathbf{K}_\tau$ is a convex cone in $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)}$ (with vertex at 0).*

Proof. Take numbers $\nu, \nu' \geq 0$ and symbols $\mathbf{w} = (\tau_i, v_i, \tau, \delta t_i, \delta t)_{i=1, \dots, s}$ and $\mathbf{w}' = (\tau'_i, v'_i, \tau, \delta t'_i, \delta t')_{i=1, \dots, s'}$. We have to find a symbol $\mathbf{v}$ such that

$$\mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{v}}(0) = \nu \mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{w}}(0) + \nu' \mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{w}'}(0).$$

Due to the remark 6.3, we may change a symbol by adding $(\tau_i, v_i, \delta t_i = 0)$ without changing the variation $u_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{w}}$. As we see from the form of (30), such an addition will not change $\mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{w}}(0)$. Consequently, we may assume that $s = s'$, $\tau_i = \tau'_i$, $v_i = v'_i$ and symbols $\mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{w}'$ differ only by δt_i and δt . Now, consider a symbol $\mathbf{v} = (\tau_i, v_i, \tau, \nu \delta t_i + \nu' \delta t'_i, \nu \delta t + \nu' \delta t')_{i=1, \dots, s}$. The formula (30) (for $\mathbf{c}(0) = 0$) is linear with respect to δt_i and δt , hence

$$\mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{v}}(0) = \nu \mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{w}}(0) + \nu' \mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{w}'}(0).$$

□

Take a point $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times M$ and denote $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbb{R}_- \times \{0\} \subset \mathbb{T}_{x_0} \mathbb{R} \times E_x = \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}}$.

Lemma 6.6. *Let $\mathbf{x}(t)$ and $u(t)$, for $t \in [t_0, t_1]$, be a solution of the optimal control problem. Then, the ray $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)}$ cannot lie in the interior of $\mathbf{K}_\tau$, for any $\tau \in (t_0, t_1)$ which is a point of continuity of u .*

Again, we postpone the proof until section 7.2.

Corollary 6.7. *For $\mathbf{x}$ and u as above, $\mathbf{K}_\tau$ is a proper convex subset of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)}$, hence there exists a covector $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)}^*$ such that, for any $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{K}_\tau$,*

$$\langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{z} \rangle_\tau \leq 0. \quad (31)$$

Lemmata 6.4 and 6.6 contain the essential geometrical information about the optimal trajectories. The curve of covectors, existence of which is states in the Maximum Principle, are just covectors supporting convex sets $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{x}(t)}$ for $t \in [t_0, t_1]$. In order to finish the proof one has to perform several rather technical, yet not very difficult steps. These are exactly the same as in the original Pontryagin's result (see [30, section 2.15]).

From now on we will assume that $u(t)$ (for $t \in [t_0, t_1]$) is a solution of the optimal control problem and $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is the associated base trajectory. Fix $\tau \in (t_0, t_1)$ being the point of continuity of u , and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)}^*$ as in the above corollary. For $t \in [t_0, \tau]$ let us define $\mathbf{z}(t) = \overline{\mathbf{B}}_{t\tau}(\mathbf{z})$.

Lemma 6.8. *For every $t \in [t_0, \tau]$ – a point of continuity of the control $u(t)$, the following "Maximum Principle" holds*

$$\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), u(t)) = \sup_{v \in U} \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), v),$$

and, moreover, $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(\tau), u(\tau)) = 0$.

Proof. Consider a symbol $\mathbf{w} = (\tau_1 = t, \delta t_1 > 0, v_1 = v, \tau, \delta t = 0)$ (here v is an arbitrary element of U). With $\mathbf{w}$ we can associate an element $\mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{w}}(0) = \mathbf{B}_{\tau t}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), v) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t))]\delta t_1 \in \mathbf{K}_{\tau}^u$. From (31) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \langle \mathbf{B}_{\tau t}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), v) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t))], \mathbf{z} \rangle_{\tau} \delta t_1 \stackrel{\text{lemma 5.5}}{=} \langle \mathbf{B}_{t\tau} \mathbf{B}_{\tau t}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), v) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t))], \overline{\mathbf{B}}_{t\tau}(\mathbf{z}) \rangle_{\tau} \delta t_1 \\ &= \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), v) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t)), \overline{\mathbf{B}}_{t\tau}(\mathbf{z}) \rangle_{\tau} \delta t_1 = \left(\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), v), \mathbf{z}(t) \rangle_{\tau} - \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t)), \mathbf{z}(t) \rangle_{\tau} \right) \delta t_1 \\ &= \left(\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), v) - \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), u(t)) \right) \delta t_1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for every $v \in U$, $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), v) \leq \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), u(t))$.

To prove the second part of the assertion take the element $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau), u(\tau))\delta t$, which clearly belongs to $\mathbf{K}_{\tau}^u$ (δt is an arbitrary real number). Consequently, from (31) we obtain

$$0 \geq \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau), u(\tau)) \rangle_{\tau} \delta t = \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(\tau), u(\tau))\delta t.$$

Since δt can be arbitrary, we deduce that $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(\tau), u(\tau)) = 0$. $\square$

To finish the proof just two more things are left. We have to check that $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), u(t))$ is constantly 0, and somehow extend $\mathbf{z}(t)$ to the whole interval $[t_0, t_1]$ (so far it was defined on $[t_0, \tau]$, where $\tau < t_1$). We will start with

Lemma 6.9. $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), u(t)) = 0$ at every point of continuity $t \in [t_0, \tau]$ of the control u .

Proof. Denote $P = \{u(t) : t \in [t_0, \tau]\}$. Since $u(t)$ is piecewise continuous, P is a compact subset of U . Define a new function $\mathbf{m} : \mathbf{A}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by the formula

$$\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{z}) = \max_{v \in P} \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}, v).$$

In view of the previous lemma, we can deduce that $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{z}(t)) = \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), u(t))$ at every point of continuity of u . We shall show that $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{z}(t))$ is constant, hence equal to $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(\tau), u(\tau)) = 0$.

The interval $[t_0, \tau]$ is compact, so $\mathbf{A}|_{\mathbf{x}(t)}$ can be covered by finitely many local coordinate charts. Take one such chart covering the interval $[t'_0, t'_1] \subset [t_0, \tau]$. We can write $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), v) = \mathbf{z}_i(t) \mathbf{f}^i(\mathbf{x}(t), v)$. Since $\dot{\mathbf{z}}_i(t)$ (compare equation (26)) as well as $\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}^a} \mathbf{f}^i(\mathbf{x}, v)$ and $\dot{\mathbf{x}}^a(t)$ are piecewise continuous and $[t'_0, t'_1]$ and P are compact, there exist a number λ such that

$$|\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), v) - \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t'), v)| \leq \lambda |t - t'|$$

for $t, t' \in [t'_0, t'_1]$ and for any $v \in P$. In consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} -\lambda |t - t'| &\leq \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), u(t')) - \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t'), u(t')) \leq \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{z}(t)) - \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{z}(t')) = \\ &= \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), u(t)) - \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t'), u(t')) \leq \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), u(t)) - \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t'), u(t)) \leq \lambda |t - t'| \end{aligned}$$

for any $t, t' \in [t'_0, t'_1]$. We deduce that $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{z}(t))$ is Lipschitz function, hence it is almost everywhere differentiable (Rademacher's theorem).

Now, take any point t of differentiability of $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{z}(t))$ which is also a point of continuity of the control $u(t)$. We have

$$\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{z}(t')) - \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{z}(t)) \geq \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t'), u(t)) - \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), u(t)).$$

For $t' > t$, we get

$$\frac{\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{z}(t')) - \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{z}(t))}{t' - t} \geq \frac{\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t'), u(t)) - \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), u(t))}{t' - t}.$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{z}(t)) \geq \frac{\partial}{\partial t'} \Big|_{t'=t} \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t'), u(t)) = 0.$$

(The last equality follows from straightforward coordinate calculations, compare lemma 5.5). Similarly, for $t' < t$, we would get $\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{z}(t)) \leq 0$. We may deduce that $\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{z}(t)) = 0$ almost everywhere in $[t_0, \tau]$, hence $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{z}(t))$ is constant. $\square$

Lemma 6.10. *Let $t \in [t_0, \tau]$ be any point of continuity of the control $u(t)$. Then $\mathbf{B}_{\tau t}(\mathbf{K}_t^u) \subset \mathbf{K}_\tau^u$.*

Proof. It is enough to show that every element from $\mathbf{K}_t^u$ of the form

$$\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t))\delta t + \sum_{i=1}^s \mathbf{B}_{t\tau_i} \left[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), v_i) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), u(\tau_i)) \right] \delta t_i$$

is mapped into $\mathbf{K}_\tau^u$ by $\mathbf{B}_{\tau t}$. Clearly,

$$\mathbf{B}_{\tau t} \left(\sum_{i=1}^s \mathbf{B}_{t\tau_i} \left[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), v_i) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), u(\tau_i)) \right] \delta t_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^s \mathbf{B}_{\tau\tau_i} \left[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), v_i) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), u(\tau_i)) \right] \delta t_i \in \mathbf{K}_\tau^u.$$

In consequence (since $\mathbf{K}_\tau^u$ is convex), it is enough to show that

$$\mathbf{B}_{\tau t}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t))\delta t) \in \mathbf{K}_\tau^u.$$

Assume the contrary. Since $\mathbf{K}_\tau^u$ is a closed convex set, there exists a hypersurface in $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)}$ (which contains 0) separating $\mathbf{K}_\tau^u$ from the element $\mathbf{B}_{\tau t}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t))\delta t)$. In other words, there exist an element $\bar{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)}^*$ such that $\langle \mathbf{B}_{\tau t}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t))\delta t), \bar{\mathbf{z}} \rangle_\tau > 0$ and, at the same time $\langle \mathbf{d}, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \rangle_\tau \leq 0$ for any $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{K}_\tau^u$.

Define $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t) = \bar{\mathbf{B}}_{t\tau}(\bar{\mathbf{z}})$. Lemmas 6.8 and 6.9 hold for $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t)$ so, in particular, $\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t)), \bar{\mathbf{z}}(t) \rangle_\tau = \mathbf{H}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t), u(t)) = 0$. On the other hand,

$$0 < \langle \mathbf{B}_{\tau t}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t))\delta t), \bar{\mathbf{z}} \rangle_\tau = \langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t)), \bar{\mathbf{z}}(t) \rangle_\tau \delta t,$$

hence $\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t)), \bar{\mathbf{z}}(t) \rangle_\tau \neq 0$. $\square$

Note that, so far, we could define the set $\mathbf{K}_\tau^u$ only for $\tau < t_1$. With the help of the above lemma we can also define $\mathbf{K}_{t_1}^u$ as a direct limit of the family of sets $\mathbf{B}_{t_1\tau}(\mathbf{K}_\tau^u)$

$$\mathbf{K}_{t_1}^u := \bigcup_{\tau < t_1} \mathbf{B}_{t_1\tau}(\mathbf{K}_\tau^u).$$

Since $\mathbf{B}_{t_1\tau}$ is a linear isomorphism, it is clear that $\mathbf{K}_{t_1}^u$ defined in such a manner is a convex cone in $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(t_1)}$ with vertex at 0. The set $\mathbf{K}_{t_1}^u$ has geometric properties analogous to the properties of $\mathbf{K}_\tau^u$ described in lemma 6.6.

Lemma 6.11. *For a solution of the optimal control problem $u(t)$, with $t \in [t_0, t_1]$, the ray $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(t_1)}$ cannot lie in the interior of $\mathbf{K}_{t_1}^u$.*

Proof. Assume the contrary. If $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(t_1)}$ lies in the interior of $\mathbf{K}_{t_1}^u$, then there exist an element $\mathbf{l} \in \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(t_1)}$ and a convex polytope $\mathbf{P} = \text{conv}\{\mathbf{l}_1, \dots, \mathbf{l}_s\} \subset \mathbf{K}_{t_1}^u$ which contains $\mathbf{l}$ as its internal point. Since $\mathbf{K}_{t_1}^u$ is defined as a limit of a increasing sequence of sets, there exists $\tau < t_1$ such that all vertices $\mathbf{l}_1, \dots, \mathbf{l}_s$ lie in $\mathbf{B}_{t_1\tau}(\mathbf{K}_\tau^u)$. Yet $\mathbf{B}_{t_1\tau}$ is a linear isomorphism that maps $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)}$ into $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(t_1)}$. Hence $\mathbf{B}_{t_1\tau}^{-1}(\mathbf{P}) \subset \mathbf{K}_\tau^u$ is a convex polytope which contains a point from $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)}$ as its

internal point. That contradicts lemma 6.6. $\square$

Now we can finish the proof of the main theorem. From the previous lemma we can deduce that $\mathbf{K}_{t_1}^u$ is a proper convex subset of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(t_1)}$ and that if $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(t_1)}$ is a subset of $\mathbf{K}_{t_1}^u$, then it lies on the boundary. Hence, there exist a covector $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(t_1)}^*$ such that for every $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{K}_{t_1}^u$ we have $\langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{z} \rangle_\tau \leq 0$ and at the same time $\langle \mathbf{l}, \mathbf{z} \rangle_\tau \geq 0$, for every $\mathbf{l} \in \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(t_1)}$. (The last inequality implies that z_0 – the $\mathbb{T}\mathbb{R}$ -component of $\mathbf{z}$, satisfies the condition $z_0 \leq 0$).

Denote $\mathbf{z}(t) = \overline{\mathbf{B}}_{tt_1}(\mathbf{z})$. Take any point $\tau \in [t_0, t_1]$ of continuity of the control u . Since $\mathbf{B}_{t_1\tau}(\mathbf{K}_\tau^u) \subset \mathbf{K}_{t_1}^u$, for every $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{K}_\tau^u$ we have

$$0 \geq \langle \mathbf{B}_{t_1\tau}(\mathbf{d}), \mathbf{z} \rangle_\tau = \langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{z}(\tau) \rangle_\tau.$$

That is enough for lemmas 6.8 and 6.9 to hold for $\mathbf{z}'(t) = \overline{\mathbf{B}}_{t\tau}(\mathbf{z}(\tau)) = \overline{\mathbf{B}}_{t\tau}\overline{\mathbf{B}}_{\tau t_1}(\mathbf{z}) = \overline{\mathbf{B}}_{tt_1}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{z}(t)$. Hence, for every point of continuity of the control u , we have

$$\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}(t), u(t)) = 0,$$

what finishes the proof of the Pontryagin Maximum Principle for almost Lie algebroids. $\square$

7 Proofs of two important lemmata.

7.1 Proof of lemma 6.4.

Recall that we deal with the family of $\mathbf{A}$ -paths $\mathbf{a}(t, \varepsilon) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), u_\varepsilon^{\mathbf{w}}(t))$, where $\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon)$ is the solution of the equation (28). We fix a continuous $\mathbf{A}$ -path $\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon)$ over $\mathbf{x}_0(\varepsilon)$. Denote by $\mathbf{B}_{ts}$ the operator of parallel transport in $\mathbf{A}$ associated with the unvariated control $u(t)$.

One may ask why it is necessary to substitute $\mathbf{a}(t, \varepsilon)$ with $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(t, \varepsilon)$ in the assertion of the lemma? This will be done due to technical reasons: $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopies are defined for $\mathbf{A}$ -paths parameterized by a fixed time interval. In order to compare classes of paths parameterized by different intervals (as is in the case of $\mathbf{a}$), we have to use tricks as reparameterization or composition with a null path.

We will start with two lemmata.

Sublemma 7.1. *For $t \in [t_0, t_1]$, let $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(t, \varepsilon) = \mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t, \varepsilon), u(t))$ be a family of $\mathbf{A}$ -paths obtained for $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t_0, \varepsilon) = \mathbf{x}_0(\varepsilon)$. Denote $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(t, \varepsilon) = \mathbf{B}_{tt_0}(\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon))$. The pair $(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}})$ is an $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopy. Hence, $\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon)$ is its initial infinitesimal homotopy and its final infinitesimal homotopy at $\varepsilon = 0$ is equal to $\mathbf{B}_{t_1 t_0}(\mathbf{c}(0))$.*

Proof. This is just the definition of the operator $\mathbf{B}_{tt_0}$ – compare (25) and definition 5.4. $\square$

Sublemma 7.2. *For $t \in [0, \delta t]$ take $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(t, \varepsilon) = \varepsilon \mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t_0 + \varepsilon t, \varepsilon), u(t_0 + \varepsilon t))$ where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t, \varepsilon)$ is as in lemma 7.1. Define $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(t, \varepsilon) = \mathbf{B}_{(t_0 + \varepsilon t)t_0}(\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon)) + t \mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t_0 + \varepsilon t, \varepsilon), u(t_0 + \varepsilon t))$. The pair $(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}})$ is an $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopy. Its initial infinitesimal $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopy is equal to $\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon)$ and its final infinitesimal homotopy at $\varepsilon = 0$ is $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\delta t, 0) = \mathbf{c}(0) + \mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t_0), u(t_0))\delta t$.*

Proof. We have to check, if for every family of functions $\varphi_i \in C_0^1([0, \delta t] \times [0, \theta])$,

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int \partial_t \varphi_i \left(\mathbf{B}_{(t_0 + \varepsilon t)t_0}^i(\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon)) + t \mathbf{f}^i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t_0 + \varepsilon t, \varepsilon), u(t_0 + \varepsilon t)) \right) dt d\varepsilon = \\ & - \int \partial_\varepsilon \varphi_i \varepsilon \mathbf{f}^i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t_0 + \varepsilon t, \varepsilon), u(t_0 + \varepsilon t)) dt d\varepsilon + \int \varphi_i c_{jk}^i \mathbf{B}_{(t_0 + \varepsilon t)t_0}^j(\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon)) \varepsilon \mathbf{f}^k(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t_0 + \varepsilon t, \varepsilon), u(t_0 + \varepsilon t)) dt d\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Now, performing the change of variables $(t, \varepsilon) \mapsto (s = t\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ in above integrals we will end up with

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int \partial_s \psi_i \mathbf{B}_{(t_0+s)t_0}^i(\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon)) ds d\varepsilon = \\ & - \int \partial_\varepsilon \psi_i \mathbf{f}^i(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t_0 + s, \varepsilon), u(t_0 + s)) ds d\varepsilon + \int \psi_i c_{jk}^i \mathbf{B}_{(t_0+s)t_0}^j(\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon)) \mathbf{f}^k(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t_0 + s, \varepsilon), u(t_0 + s)) ds d\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where $\psi_i(t\varepsilon, \varepsilon) = \varphi_i(t, \varepsilon)$. This is just the condition for the pair $(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}})$ from the previous lemma to be an $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopy. What is more, since $\partial_\varepsilon \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t_0 + s, \varepsilon) = \rho(\mathbf{B}_{(t_0+s)t_0}(c(\varepsilon)))$, using the admissibility of $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}$ we have $\partial_\varepsilon \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t_0 + t\varepsilon, \varepsilon) = \rho(\mathbf{B}_{(t_0+t\varepsilon)t_0}(c(\varepsilon))) + t\rho(f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t_0 + t\varepsilon, \varepsilon)))$, hence $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(t, \varepsilon)$ is ε -admissible. $\square$

Now, the proof will be inductive with respect to s – the number of elements in a symbol $\mathbf{w} = (\tau_i, v_i, \tau, \delta t_i, \delta t)_{i=1, \dots, s}$.

1. First step. For $s = 0$ we have $\mathbf{w} = (\tau, \delta t)$ and $u_\varepsilon^\mathbf{w}(t) = u(t)$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{a}(t, \varepsilon)_{t \in [t_0, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]}] &= [\mathbf{a}(t, \varepsilon)_{t \in [t_0, \tau]}] [\mathbf{a}(t, \varepsilon)_{t \in [\tau, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]}] = \\ &= [\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), u(t))_{t \in [t_0, \tau]}] [\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), u(t))_{t \in [\tau, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]}] = \\ &= [\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), u(t))_{t \in [t_0, \tau]}] [\varepsilon \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau + t\varepsilon, \varepsilon), u(\tau + \varepsilon t))_{t \in [0, \delta t]}] \end{aligned}$$

(here we used lemma 4.12 to reparameterize the second term).

It follows from lemma 7.1 that the pair $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1(t, \varepsilon) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), u(t))$ and $\bar{\mathbf{b}}_1(t, \varepsilon) = \mathbf{B}_{tt_0}(\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon))$, where $t \in [t_0, \tau]$, is an $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopy. Similarly, from lemma 7.2 we conclude that $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_2(t, \varepsilon) = \varepsilon \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau + t\varepsilon, \varepsilon), u(\tau + \varepsilon t))$ and $\bar{\mathbf{b}}_2(t, \varepsilon) = \mathbf{B}_{(\tau + \varepsilon t)\tau}(\bar{\mathbf{b}}_1(\tau, \varepsilon)) + t \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau + \varepsilon t, \varepsilon), u(\tau + \varepsilon t))$, where $t \in [0, \delta t]$, is also an $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopy. These homotopies are composable. Their composition $(\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}) = (\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{b}}_1) \circ (\bar{\mathbf{a}}_2, \bar{\mathbf{b}}_2)$ has the property that $[\mathbf{a}(t, \varepsilon)_{t \in [t_0, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]}] = [\bar{\mathbf{a}}(t, \varepsilon)_{t \in [t_0, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]}]$ and the initial infinitesimal $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopy is equal to $\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon)$. Moreover, $\bar{\mathbf{b}}(\tau + \delta t, 0) = \mathbf{B}_{(\tau + 0\delta t)\tau}(\mathbf{B}_{\tau t_0}(\mathbf{c}(0))) + \delta t \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau), u(\tau)) = \mathbf{B}_{\tau t_0}(\mathbf{c}(0)) + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau), u(\tau)) \delta t$.

2. Inductive step. Assume that the assertion holds for all $k < s$. We will consider two possible situations:

2.1 $t_0 < \tau_1 \leq \dots \leq \tau_k < \tau_{k+1} = \tau_{k+2} = \dots = \tau_s = \tau$.

From the inductive assumption for $\mathbf{w} = (\tau_i, v_i, \tau = \tau_k, \delta t_i, \delta t = 0)_{i=1, \dots, k}$ we know that there exist an $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopy $(\bar{\mathbf{a}}(t, \varepsilon), \bar{\mathbf{b}}(t, \varepsilon))$ (where $t \in [\tilde{t}_0, \tilde{t}_1]$) such that the initial infinitesimal homotopy is $\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon)$, $[\bar{\mathbf{a}}(t, \varepsilon)_{t \in [\tilde{t}_0, \tilde{t}_1]}] = [\mathbf{a}(t, \varepsilon)_{t \in [t_0, \tau_k]}]$ and the final infinitesimal homotopy satisfies

$$\bar{\mathbf{b}}(\tilde{t}_1, 0) = \mathbf{B}_{\tau_k t_0}(c(0)) + \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{B}_{\tau_k \tau_i} [\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), v_i) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), u(\tau_i))] \delta t_i.$$

We can decompose

$$[\mathbf{a}(t, \varepsilon)_{t \in [t_0, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]}] = [\mathbf{a}(t, \varepsilon)_{t \in [t_0, \tau_k]}] [\mathbf{a}(t, \varepsilon)_{t \in [\tau_k, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]}] = [\bar{\mathbf{a}}(t, \varepsilon)_{t \in [\tilde{t}_0, \tilde{t}_1]}] [\mathbf{a}(t, \varepsilon)_{t \in [\tau_k, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]}].$$

Recall first, that $I_p = [\tau + \varepsilon \delta t - \varepsilon(\delta t_s + \dots, \delta t_p), \tau + \varepsilon \delta t - \varepsilon(\delta t_s + \dots, \delta t_{p+1})] =: [t_p, t_p + \varepsilon \delta t_p]$, where $p = k + 1, \dots, s$ and that the control $u_\varepsilon^\mathbf{w}(t)$ equals v_p on the interval I_p . The last term in the above decomposition equals

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{a}(t, \varepsilon)_{t \in [\tau_k, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]}] &= \\ & [\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), u(t))_{t \in [\tau_k, \tau - \varepsilon(\delta t_{k+1} + \dots + \delta t_s - \delta t)}] [\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), v_{k+1})_{t \in I_{k+1}}] \dots [\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), v_s)_{t \in I_s}] = \\ & \left([\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), u(t))_{t \in [\tau_k, \tau]}] [-\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), u(t))_{t \in [\tau, \tau - \varepsilon(\delta t_{k+1} + \dots + \delta t_s - \delta t)}] \right) \\ & [\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), v_{k+1})_{t \in I_{k+1}}] \dots [\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), v_s)_{t \in I_s}] = \\ & [\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), u(t))_{t \in [\tau_k, \tau]}] [-\varepsilon \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau + t\varepsilon, \varepsilon), u(\tau + t\varepsilon))_{t \in [0, -(\delta t_{k+1} + \dots + \delta t_s - \delta t)}] \\ & [\varepsilon \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t_{k+1} + t\varepsilon, \varepsilon), v_{k+1})_{t \in [0, \delta t_{k+1}]}] \dots [\varepsilon \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t_s + t\varepsilon, \varepsilon), v_s)_{t \in [0, \delta t_s]}]. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the above expression is the composition of several families of $\mathbf{A}$ -paths of which the first is of the form from lemma 7.1 and other of the form of lemma 7.2. In light of those lemmas each of the factors can be regarded as $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopy, provided that one chose initial infinitesimal $\mathbf{A}$ -path (to be precise we have to modify the result from lemma 7.2 a little bit – instead of the flow $\mathbf{B}_{ts}$ associated with the control $u(t)$ one has to take a flow associated with a constant control v_i). The natural idea is to choose this initial paths in such a way that these homotopies are composable and, moreover, the resulting composed homotopy can be composed with $(\bar{\mathbf{a}}(t, \varepsilon), \bar{\mathbf{b}}(t, \varepsilon))$. Indeed, all one has to do is to choose initial path of each factor to be equal to the final path of the former factor. The resulting homotopy has desired properties. Its initial infinitesimal homotopy equals $\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon)$ and the final homotopy at $\varepsilon = 0$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{w}}(0) &= \mathbf{B}_{\tau\tau_k}^u(\bar{\mathbf{b}}(\tilde{t}_1, 0)) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau), u(\tau))(\delta t_{k+1} + \dots \delta t_s - \delta t) + \\
&\quad \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_{k+1}), v_{k+1})\delta t_{k+1} + \dots \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_s), v_s)\delta t_s = \\
&= \mathbf{B}_{\tau\tau_k}^u\left(\mathbf{B}_{\tau_k t_0}^u(c(0)) + \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{B}_{\tau_k \tau_i}^u[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), v_i) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), u(\tau_i))]\delta t_i\right) + \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=k+1}^s [\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), v_i)\delta t_i - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), u(\tau_i))\delta t_i + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau), u(\tau))\delta t] = \\
&= \mathbf{B}_{\tau t_0}^u(c(0)) + \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{B}_{\tau \tau_i}^u[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), v_i) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), u(\tau_i))]\delta t_i + \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=k+1}^s \mathbf{B}_{\tau \tau}^u[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), v_i)\delta t_i - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), u(\tau_i))\delta t_i + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau), u(\tau))\delta t] = \\
&= \mathbf{B}_{\tau t_0}^u(c(0)) + \sum_{i=1}^s \mathbf{B}_{\tau \tau_i}^u[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), v_i) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau_i), u(\tau_i))]\delta t_i + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(\tau), u(\tau))\delta t.
\end{aligned}$$

□

2.2 $t_0 < \tau_1 \leq \dots \leq \tau_k < \tau_{k+1} = \tau_{k+2} = \dots = \tau_s < \tau$.

In this situation we may write

$$[\mathbf{a}(t, \epsilon)_{t \in [t_0, \tau + \epsilon \delta t]}] = [\mathbf{a}(t, \epsilon)_{t \in [t_0, \tau_s]}][\mathbf{a}(t, \epsilon)_{t \in [\tau_s, \tau + \epsilon \delta t]}].$$

Using part 2.1 with $\mathbf{w} = (\tau_i, v_i, \tau = \tau_s, \delta t_i, \delta t = 0)_{i=1, \dots, s}$, we may write the first factor as an $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopy, whereas the second one can be made into homotopy with the help of part 1. Their composition will be the desired $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopy. □

Remark 7.3. Observe that $\mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{w}}(s)$ was constructed as a final infinitesimal $\mathbf{A}$ -homotopy, hence as a weak solution of some set of differential equations. These equations are continuous with respect to controls and trajectories. Consequently, for $\mathbf{w} = (\tau_i, v_i, \tau, \delta t_i, \delta t)_{i=1, \dots, s}$, the final infinitesimal homotopy $\mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{w}}(s)$ depends continuously on δt_i and δt (τ_i, v_i and τ are fixed).

7.2 Proof of lemma 6.6.

Let $\mathbf{x}(t) = (x^0(t), x(t))$ and $u(t)$, for $t \in [t_0, t_1]$, be a solution of the optimal control problem. Assume the opposite to the thesis of lemma 6.6, that is that the ray $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)} = \mathbb{R}_- \times \{0\} \subset \mathbb{T}_{x^0(\tau)}\mathbb{R} \times E_{x(\tau)} = \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)}$ lies in the interior of $\mathbf{K}_{\tau}^u$ for some $\tau \in (t_0, t_1)$ which is a point of continuity of u . We shall show that there exists a symbol $\mathbf{w} = (\tau_i, v_i, \tau, \delta t_i, \delta t)_{i=1, \dots, s}$ and a number $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the $\mathbf{A}$ -path $\mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{w}}(s) = (d_0^{\mathbf{w}}(s), d^{\mathbf{w}}(s))$ constructed in the proof of lemma 6.4 satisfies the following conditions:

1. the projection $d^{\mathbf{w}}(s)_{s \in [0, \varepsilon]}$ of $\mathbf{d}^{\mathbf{w}}(s)_{s \in [0, \varepsilon]}$ to the algebroid E is homotopic to 0,

2. for every $s \in [0, \varepsilon]$, $d_0^{\mathfrak{w}}(s)$ – the $\mathbb{T}\mathbb{R}$ -component of $\mathbf{d}^{\mathfrak{w}}(s)$, is smaller than 0.

The existence of such an $\mathbf{A}$ -path will contradict the optimality of $\mathbf{x}(t)$ and $u(t)$. Indeed, denote by $u_\varepsilon^{\mathfrak{w}}(t)$ the variation of the control $u(t)$ associated with the symbol $\mathfrak{w}$. Let $\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon) = (x^0(t, \varepsilon), x(t, \varepsilon))$ be the solution of the differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon) = \rho_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), u_\varepsilon^{\mathfrak{w}}(t))) \\ \mathbf{x}(t_0, \varepsilon) = \mathbf{x}_0. \end{cases}$$

From lemma 6.4 we know that

$$[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t, \varepsilon), u_\varepsilon^{\mathfrak{w}}(t))_{t \in [t_0, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]}] = [\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t))_{t \in [t_0, \tau]}][\mathbf{d}^{\mathfrak{w}}(s)_{s \in [0, \varepsilon]}]. \quad (32)$$

After projecting this equality to E we will get

$$[f(x(t, \varepsilon), u_\varepsilon^{\mathfrak{w}}(t))_{t \in [t_0, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]}] = [f(x(t), u(t))_{t \in [t_0, \tau]}][0].$$

Clearly, $x(\tau + \varepsilon \delta t, \varepsilon) = x(\tau)$. What is more, $x^0(\tau + \varepsilon \delta t, \varepsilon) < x^0(\tau)$. Indeed, projecting (32) to the algebroid $\mathbb{T}\mathbb{R}$ we get

$$[L(x(t, \varepsilon), u_\varepsilon(t))_{t \in [t_0, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]}] = [L(x(t), u(t))_{t \in [t_0, \tau]}][d_0^{\mathfrak{w}}(s)_{s \in [0, \varepsilon]}].$$

Since $d_0^{\mathfrak{w}}(s) < 0$, we have

$$x^0(t, \varepsilon) = \int_{t_0}^{\tau + \varepsilon \delta t} L(x(s, \varepsilon), u_\varepsilon(s)) ds = \int_{t_0}^{\tau} L(x(s), u(s)) ds + \int_0^{\varepsilon} d_0^{\mathfrak{w}}(s) ds < \int_{t_0}^{\tau} L(x(s), u(s)) ds = x^0(\tau).$$

Now, consider a new control

$$u^*(t) = \begin{cases} u_\varepsilon^{\mathfrak{w}}(t) & \text{for } t \in [t_0, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t] \\ u(t - \varepsilon \delta t) & \text{for } t \in [\tau + \varepsilon \delta t, t_1 + \varepsilon \delta t] \end{cases}$$

and the solution $\mathbf{x}^*(t) = (x^{0*}(t), x^*(t))$ of the differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{x}^*(t) = \rho_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*(t), u^*(t))) \\ \mathbf{x}^*(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0. \end{cases}$$

Observe that

$$x^*(t) = \begin{cases} x(t, \varepsilon) & \text{for } t \in [t_0, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t], \\ x(t - \varepsilon \delta t) & \text{for } t \in [\tau + \varepsilon \delta t, t_1 + \varepsilon \delta t]. \end{cases}$$

The pair $(\mathbf{x}^*(t), u^*(t))$ contradicts the optimality of $(\mathbf{x}(t), u(t))$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} [f(x^*(t), u^*(t))_{t \in [t_0, t_1 + \varepsilon \delta t]}] &= [f(x^*(t), u^*(t))_{t \in [t_0, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]}][f(x^*(t), u^*(t))_{t \in [\tau + \varepsilon \delta t, t_1 + \varepsilon \delta t]}] \\ &= [f(x(t, \varepsilon), u_\varepsilon^{\mathfrak{w}}(t))_{t \in [t_0, \tau + \varepsilon \delta t]}][f(x(t - \varepsilon \delta t), u(t - \varepsilon \delta t))_{t \in [\tau + \varepsilon \delta t, t_1 + \varepsilon \delta t]}] \\ &= [f(x(t), u(t))_{t \in [t_0, \tau]}][f(x(t), u(t))_{t \in [\tau, t_1]}] = [f(x(t), u(t))_{t \in [t_0, t_1]}], \end{aligned}$$

hence the homotopy classes in E agree.

Second, the cost on the trajectory $x^*(t)$ is, however, smaller than that on $x(t)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_0}^{t_1 + \varepsilon \delta t} L(x^*(s), u^*(s)) ds &= \int_{t_0}^{\tau + \varepsilon \delta t} L(x(s, \varepsilon), u_\varepsilon^{\mathfrak{w}}(s)) ds + \int_{\tau + \varepsilon \delta t}^{t_1 + \varepsilon \delta t} L(x(s - \varepsilon \delta t), u(s - \varepsilon \delta t)) ds < \\ &< \int_{t_0}^{\tau + \varepsilon \delta t} L(x(s), u(s)) ds + \int_{\tau}^{t_1} L(x(s), u(s)) ds = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} L(x(s), u(s)) ds. \end{aligned}$$

What is now left to prove is the existence of a symbol $\mathfrak{w}$ satisfying 1. and 2. Choose a vector $\lambda = (-\partial_t, 0) \in \mathbb{T}_{x^0(\tau)} \mathbb{R} \times E_{x(\tau)} = \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)}$ spanning the ray $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)}$. Since we assumed that $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)}$ lies in the interior of $\mathbf{K}_\tau^u$, there exists a basis $(\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_m)$ of $\{0\} \times E_{x(\tau)} \subset \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)}$ such that vectors $\lambda, \lambda + \mathbf{e}_i, \lambda - \mathbf{e}_i$ lie in $\mathbf{K}_\tau^u$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Consequently, there are symbols $\mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}_i, \mathfrak{v}_i$, such that $\mathbf{d}^{\mathfrak{w}}(0) = \lambda$, $\mathbf{d}^{\mathfrak{w}_i}(0) = \lambda + \mathbf{e}_i$ and $\mathbf{d}^{\mathfrak{v}_i}(0) = \lambda - \mathbf{e}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ (this is not completely true – compare remark 7.5). We deal with a finite set of symbols, hence we can assume that they all are of the form $\mathfrak{w} = (\tau_i, v_i, \tau, \delta t_i, \delta t)_{i=1, \dots, s}$, where τ_i, v_i are fixed, and differ by δt_i and δt (we can always add triple $(\tau_i, v_i, \delta t_i = 0)$ to a symbol without changing anything – compare remark 6.3). Introduce functions

$$h^+(r) = \begin{cases} r & \text{for } r \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{for } r < 0, \end{cases} \quad h^-(r) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } r \geq 0, \\ -r & \text{for } r < 0. \end{cases}$$

For $\vec{r} = \sum_{i=1}^m r^i \mathbf{e}_i$ such that $\sum (r^i)^2 \leq 1$, we may define a new symbol

$$\mathfrak{w}(\vec{r}) = (1 - \frac{1}{m} \sum |r^i|) \mathfrak{w} + \frac{1}{m} \sum h^+(r^i) \mathfrak{w}_i + \frac{1}{m} \sum h^-(r^i) \mathfrak{v}_i.$$

Here the convex combination of symbols is defined using the rule

$$\nu(\tau_i, v_i, \tau, \delta t_i, \delta t)_{i=1, \dots, s} + \mu(\tau_i, v_i, \tau, \delta t'_i, \delta t')_{i=1, \dots, s} = (\tau_i, v_i, \tau, \nu \delta t_i + \mu \delta t'_i, \nu \delta t + \mu \delta t')_{i=1, \dots, s}.$$

It is straightforward to see (compare lemma 6.5) that for this new symbol

$$\mathbf{d}^{\mathfrak{w}(\vec{r})}(0) = \lambda + \frac{1}{m} \vec{r}.$$

Moreover, due to remark 7.3, $\mathbf{d}^{\mathfrak{w}(\vec{r})}(s)$ depends continuously on $\vec{r}$. Every admissible path $\mathbf{d}^{\mathfrak{w}(\vec{r})}(s)$ is defined only on a finite interval $s \in [0, \theta(\vec{r})]$. It follows from the proof of lemma 6.4 that $\theta(\vec{r})$ depends continuously on the positions of switching-points τ_i and numbers δt_i in a symbol $\mathfrak{w}(\vec{r}) = (\tau_i, v_i, \tau, \delta t_i, \delta t)_{i=1, \dots, s}$. So that since these are continuous with respect to $\vec{r}$, and it belongs to a compact set $\{\sum r^i \mathbf{e}_i : \sum (r^i)^2 \leq 1\}$, θ can be chosen universally for all $\vec{r}$ s. Since the $\mathbb{T}\mathbb{R}$ -th component of $\mathbf{d}^{\mathfrak{w}(\vec{r})}(s)$ is continuous with respect to $\vec{r}$ and s and is equal $-\partial_t$ at $s = 0$, we may assume (after shrinking θ if necessary) that it is smaller than 0 for every $s \in [0, \theta]$. Thus all curves $\mathbf{d}^{\mathfrak{w}(\vec{r})}(s)$ satisfy condition 2 and we can thus concentrate ourselves on condition 1.

After projecting $\mathbf{d}^{\mathfrak{w}(\vec{r})}(s)$ from $\mathbf{A}$ to E , we obtain a family of continuous admissible paths $d^{\mathfrak{w}(\vec{r})}(s)$, with $s \in [0, \theta]$ and continuously parameterized by $\vec{r} \in B(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, satisfying $d^{\mathfrak{w}(\vec{r})}(0) = \frac{1}{m} \vec{r} \in \mathbb{R}^m \approx E_{x(\tau)}$.

Since we are only interested in E -homotopy classes of these curves (perhaps after restricting s to the smaller interval $[0, \varepsilon] \subset [0, \theta]$), using the reparameterization lemma 4.12 we may assume that $\theta = 1$. After possible rescaling the basis of $E_{x(\tau)}$ we can assume that $d^{\mathfrak{w}(\vec{r})}(0) = \vec{r} \in \mathbb{R}^m \approx E_{x(\tau)}$.

It will be convenient to extend this basis to a basis of local sections of E and to introduce local coordinates (x^a) on M around the point $x(\tau) = 0$. In this way we have constructed local coordinates (x^a, y^i) on E . As usual, $\rho_i^a(x)$ and $c_{jk}^i(x)$ will denote the structural functions of the algebroid E in this coordinates. Since these are smooth, we can assume that they are bounded (by a number C_ρ and C_c respectively) and Lipschitz (with constants L_ρ and L_c respectively) with respect to x^a .

The following proposition will finish the proof.

Proposition 7.4. *Let $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto a_{\vec{r}}(t)$ be a family of continuous admissible paths, continuously parameterized by vectors $\vec{r} \in B(0, 1)$, such that $\tau_E(a_{\vec{r}}(0)) = 0$ and $a_{\vec{r}}(0) = \vec{r}$ for each $\vec{r} \in B(0, 1)$.*

There exists a vector $\vec{r}$ and a number $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ such that the curve $a_{\vec{r}}(t)$, after restricting to the interval $[0, \varepsilon]$, is E -homotopic to the null path

$$[a_{\vec{r}}(t)]_{t \in [0, \varepsilon]} = [0].$$

Proof. Assume the contrary. We are interested in controlling the homotopy classes of admissible paths. The idea is to build a map which will allow us to index these classes (locally).

Denote by $C_{\text{Tr}=0}^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m)$ the Banach subspace of $C^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m)$ consisting of curves $a(t)$ which satisfy the condition $\int_0^1 a(t) dt = 0$. Denote by $c_{\vec{r}}(t)$ the path constantly equal to $\vec{r}$.

We will build a map Φ ,

$$\mathbb{R}^m \times C_{\text{Tr}=0}^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m) \supset U_0 \xrightarrow{\Phi} C^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m)$$

defined on some open neighbourhood U_0 of $(0, 0)$ in $\mathbb{R}^m \times C_{\text{Tr}=0}^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m)$ with the following properties.

A Φ maps $(\vec{r}, 0)$ into a constant path $c_{\vec{r}} \in C^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m)$.

B Φ is a continuous map of Banach spaces.

C The E -homotopy class of the curve $\Phi(\vec{r}, d)$ is determined by $\vec{r}$, that is:

$$[\Phi(\vec{r}, d)] = [\Phi(\vec{r}, 0)] \stackrel{(A)}{=} [c_{\vec{r}}].$$

D The map $\tilde{\Phi}(\vec{r}, d) := \Phi(\vec{r}, d) - (c_{\vec{r}} + d)$ is Lipschitz with constant $\frac{1}{6}$.

E The map Φ posses continuous inverse Φ^{-1} defined on some open neighbourhood $V_0 \ni 0$ in $C^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m)$. Moreover, Φ^{-1} is Lipschitz with constant 6.

We will finish the proof of proposition 7.4, showing the existence of the map Φ . Indeed, $a_{\vec{r}}(t)$ is continuous with respect to both: $\vec{r}$ and t , and $a_{\vec{r}}(t) - \vec{r} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$, hence there exists a number $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $|a_{\vec{R}}(t) - \vec{R}| < \frac{1}{12}$ for every $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$ and every $\vec{R} \in \partial B(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. Consequently, for every $t \in [0, 1]$ and $\vec{R} \in \partial B(0, 1)$,

$$|\tilde{a}_{\vec{R}}(t) - \varepsilon \vec{R}| < \frac{1}{12} \varepsilon,$$

where $\tilde{a}_{\vec{r}}(t) := \varepsilon a_{\vec{r}}(\varepsilon t)$. The number ε can be chosen so small that for every $\vec{r} \in B(0, 1)$ the curve $\tilde{a}_{\vec{r}}$ lies in V_0 . From lemma 4.12 we deduce that

$$[\tilde{a}_{\vec{r}}(t)]_{t \in [0, 1]} = [a_{\vec{r}}(t)]_{t \in [0, \varepsilon]}.$$

Since we assumed that the thesis of proposition 7.4 is not satisfied, these classes are different from 0.

The family $a_{\vec{r}}(t)$ was continuous, hence so is $\tilde{a}_{\vec{r}}(t)$. Consequently, we have a continuous map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}^m \supset B(0, 1) &\xrightarrow{\xi} V_0 \subset C^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m), \\ \vec{r} &\longmapsto \tilde{a}_{\vec{r}}. \end{aligned}$$

Composing ξ with Φ^{-1} , we will obtain a continuous map

$$B(0, 1) \xrightarrow{(\psi, \phi)} \mathbb{R}^m \times C_{\text{Tr}=0}^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m).$$

Since Φ has the property **C** of preserving the E -homotopy classes and since we assumed that $[\tilde{a}_{\vec{r}}] \neq [0]$, the map ψ maps the ball $B(0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ continuously into $\mathbb{R}^m - \{0\}$. Since $\|\tilde{a}_{\vec{R}} - c_{\varepsilon\vec{R}}\| \leq \frac{1}{12}\varepsilon$ for $\vec{R} \in \partial B(0,1)$, using the Lipschitz condition for Φ^{-1} (property **E**) and the fact that $\Phi^{-1}(c_{\vec{r}}) = (\vec{r}, 0)$ (property **A**), we obtain

$$|\psi(\vec{R}) - \varepsilon\vec{R}| \leq |\psi(\vec{R}) - \varepsilon\vec{R}| + \|\phi(\vec{R}) - 0\| = \|\Phi^{-1}(\tilde{a}_{\vec{R}}) - \Phi^{-1}(c_{\varepsilon\vec{R}})\| \leq 6\|\tilde{a}_{\vec{R}} - c_{\varepsilon\vec{R}}\| \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon.$$

Consequently, the set $\psi(\partial B(0,1))$ is not contractible in $\mathbb{R}^m - \{0\}$, as it is homotopic to the circle $\varepsilon\partial B(0,1)$ in $\mathbb{R}^m - \{0\}$ ($h(\vec{R}, s) = s\psi(\vec{R}) + (1-s)\varepsilon\vec{R}$ is the homotopy). On the other hand, $(s, \vec{R}) \mapsto \psi(s\vec{R})$ is an obvious contraction in $\text{im}(\psi) \subset \mathbb{R}^m - \{0\}$. This contradiction proves proposition 7.4. $\square$

Constructions of the maps Φ .

Now we should construct the map Φ which satisfies conditions **A** – **E**.

Consider an affine differential equation for a curve $(a(s), x(s))$ in $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with parameters $b, d \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and initial conditions a_0, x_0

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s a^i(s) = d^i + c_{jk}^i(x(s))a^j(s)b^k, \\ a^i(0) = a_0^i, \\ \partial_s x^b(s) = \rho_i^b(x(s))b^i, \\ x^b(0) = x_0^b. \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

Let $(G(s, a_0, x_0, b, d), H(s, x_0, b))$ be a general solution of this equation. Since the right hand side of (33) is smooth with respect to all variables and parameters, the general theory of ODE's guarantees (confront for example [2]) that functions G and H are well defined and smooth on a sufficiently small neighbourhood $J \times U_a \times U_x \times U_b \times U_d$ of $(s=0, a_0=0, x_0=0, b=0, d=0)$. Observe that (33) is homogenous of order 1 with respect to b and d . Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} G(\lambda s, a_0, x_0, b, d) &= G(s, a_0, x_0, \lambda b, \lambda d); \\ H(\lambda s, x_0, b) &= H(s, x_0, \lambda b). \end{aligned}$$

We deduce (after shrinking U_b and U_d if necessary) that G and H are well defined and smooth on an open neighbourhood $(-2, 2) \times U_a \times U_x \times U_b \times U_d$ of $(0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$.

Take now any path $a \in C^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m)$ and $d \in C_{\text{Tr}=0}^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m)$. Let us define $b(t) = \int_0^t d(s)ds$ (mind that $b(0) = b(1) = 0$). Let $x(t)$ be the solution of the equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t x^a(t) = \rho_i^a(x(t))a^i(t) \\ x(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

We define a curve

$$\Psi(a, d)(t) := G(1, a(t), x(t), b(t), d(t)).$$

Is is clear that if $\|a\|$ and $\|d\|$ are sufficiently small, the curve $\Psi(a, d)$ is well defined and continuous. Moreover, $\Psi(s, d)$ is an admissible path covering $H(1, x(t), b(t))$ and it is E -homotopic (with fixed end points) to an admissible path $a(t)$ covering $x(t)$.

Indeed, the E -homotopy condition becomes clear if one observes that $(\Psi(a, d)(t), H(1, x(t), b(t)))$ is by definition the solution $(a(t, s), x(t, s))$ of the differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s a^i(t, s) = \partial_t b^i(t) + c_{jk}^i(x(t, s))a^j(t, s)b^k(t) \\ a(t, 0) = a(t) \\ \partial_s x^a(t, s) = \rho_i^a(x(t, s))b^i(t, s) \\ x(t, 0) = x(t) \end{cases}$$

taken at $s = 1$, where $b(t)$ satisfies the conditions $b(0) = b(1) = 0$ (compare the definition 4.1 of E -homotopy).

To sum up, we have obtained a map

$$C^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m) \times C_{\text{Tr}=0}^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m) \supset W_0 \xrightarrow{\Psi} C^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m)$$

defined on some open neighbourhood $W_0 \ni (0, 0)$ in $C^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m) \times C_{\text{Tr}=0}^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m)$. We shall now prove the following properties of Ψ :

A1 $\Psi(a, 0) = a$.

B1 Ψ is a continuous map of Banach spaces.

C1 The E -homotopy class of curve $\Psi(a, d)$ is determined by a , that is

$$[\Psi(a, d)] = [\Psi(a, 0)] \stackrel{(\text{A1})}{=} [a].$$

D1 The function $\tilde{\Psi}(a, d) := \Psi(a, d) - (a + d)$ is Lipschitz with constant $\frac{1}{6}$.

The property **C1** has already been proven. The property **A1** is clear, as $\Psi(a, 0)$ is the solution of the differential equation $\partial_s a(t, s) = 0$ with initial condition $a(t, 0) = a(t)$. Condition **B1** will follow from **D1**. Indeed the map $(a, d) \mapsto (a + d)$ is continuous, and if **D1** holds, the map $\tilde{\Psi}$ is Lipschitz, hence also continuous. We can thus write $\Psi(a, d) = \tilde{\Psi}(a, d) + (a + d)$ as a sum of two continuous maps.

Proof of property D1. Let (a, d) and (a', d') be two elements of W_0 . Denote by $b(t)$, $b'(t)$, $a(t, s)$, $a'(t, s)$, $x(t, s)$ and $x'(t, s)$ the curves and maps defined as above associated with each of these elements. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \delta a(t, s) &:= a(t, s) - (a(t) + sd(t)), \\ \delta a'(t, s) &:= a'(t, s) - (a'(t) + sd'(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\tilde{\Psi}(a, d) = \delta a(t, 1)$ and $\tilde{\Psi}(a', d') = \delta a'(t, 1)$.

Our goal is to estimate the difference $|\delta a(t, s) - \delta a'(t, s)|$. We will start with proving the following statement:

$$\|b - b'\| \leq \|d - d'\|. \quad (35)$$

Indeed,

$$|b(t) - b'(t)| = \left| \int_0^t (d(s) - d'(s)) ds \right| \leq \int_0^1 |d(s) - d'(s)| ds \leq \|d - d'\|.$$

Now we shall prove that

$$\sup_{(t,s)} |x(t, s) - x'(t, s)| \left(1 - L_\rho \|d\| \right) \leq C_\rho \|d - d'\|. \quad (36)$$

Observe that $x(t, s)$ (and analogously $x'(t, s)$) satisfies the integral equation

$$x^b(t, s) = \int_0^s \rho_i^b(x(t, \sigma)) b^i(t) d\sigma.$$

Consequently (for simplicity we omit the indices in the calculations),

$$\begin{aligned}
|x(t, s) - x'(t, s)| &= \left| \int_0^s \left(\rho(x(t, \sigma))b(t) - \rho(x'(t, \sigma))b'(t) \right) d\sigma \right| \leq \\
&\leq \int_0^1 \left| \rho(x(t, \sigma))b(t) - \rho(x'(t, \sigma))b'(t) \right| d\sigma \leq \\
&\leq \int_0^1 \left| \left(\rho(x(t, \sigma)) - \rho(x'(t, \sigma)) \right) b(t) \right| d\sigma + \int_0^1 \left| \rho(x'(t, \sigma)) (b(t) - b'(t)) \right| d\sigma \leq \\
&\leq L_\rho \sup_{(t,s)} |x(t, s) - x'(t, s)| \|d\| + C_\rho \|d - d'\|. \tag{37}
\end{aligned}$$

Next we will show that

$$\sup_{(t,s)} |a(t, s)| (1 - C_c \|d\|) \leq \|a\| + \|d\|. \tag{38}$$

Observe first that $a(t, s)$ satisfies the integral equation

$$a^i(t, s) = a^i(t) + \int_0^s d^i(t) + c_{jk}^i(x(t, \sigma)) a^j(t, \sigma) b^k(t) d\sigma. \tag{39}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
|a(t, s)| &= \left| a(t) + \int_0^s d(t) + c_{jk}^i(x(t, \sigma)) a(t, \sigma) b(t) d\sigma \right| \leq \\
&\leq \|a\| + \|d\| + \int_0^1 \left| c_{jk}^i(x(t, \sigma)) a(t, \sigma) b(t) \right| d\sigma \stackrel{(35)}{\leq} \|a\| + \|d\| + C_c \sup_{(t,s)} |a(t, s)| \|d\|.
\end{aligned}$$

From estimations (36) and (38) we see that if we take $\|d\|$ sufficiently small (that means if we possibly shrink the set W_0), we may assume that

$$\sup_{(t,s)} |x(t, s) - x'(t, s)| \leq 2C_\rho \|d - d'\| \quad \text{and} \tag{40}$$

$$\sup_{(t,s)} |a(t, s)| \leq 2\|a\| + 2\|d\|. \tag{41}$$

From (39) we deduce that $\delta a(t, s)$ satisfies

$$\delta a^i(t, s) = \int_0^s c_{jk}^i(x(t, \sigma)) a^j(t, \sigma) b^k(t) d\sigma.$$

We deduce further that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\delta a(t, s) - \delta a'(t, s)| &= \left| \int_0^s \left(c_{jk}^i(x(t, \sigma)) a(t, \sigma) b(t) - c_{jk}^i(x'(t, \sigma)) a'(t, \sigma) b'(t) \right) d\sigma \right| \leq \\
&\leq \int_0^1 \left| c_{jk}^i(x(t, \sigma)) a(t, \sigma) b(t) - c_{jk}^i(x'(t, \sigma)) a'(t, \sigma) b'(t) \right| d\sigma \leq \\
&\leq \int_0^1 \left| c_{jk}^i(x(t, \sigma)) - c_{jk}^i(x'(t, \sigma)) \right| |a(t, \sigma) b(t)| d\sigma + \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 |c_{jk}^i(x'(t, \sigma))| |a(t, \sigma) - a'(t, \sigma)| |b(t)| d\sigma + \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 |c_{jk}^i(x'(t, \sigma))| |a'(t, \sigma)| |b(t) - b'(t)| d\sigma
\end{aligned}$$

The latter is obviously smaller than

$$\begin{aligned} L_c \sup_{(t,s)} |x(t,s) - x'(t,s)| \sup_{(t,s)} |a(t,s)| \|d\| + C_c \left(\|a - a'\| + \|d - d'\| + \sup_{(t,s)} |\delta a(t,s) - \delta a'(t,s)| \right) \|d\| + \\ + C_c \sup_{(t,s)} |a'(t,s)| \|d - d'\|. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality combined with (40) and (41) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(t,s)} |\delta a(t,s) - \delta a'(t,s)| \left(1 - C_c \|d\| \right) \leq \|d - d'\| \left(4L_c C_\rho (\|a\| + \|d\|) \|d\| + C_c \|d\| + 2C_c (\|a'\| + \|d'\|) \right) + \\ + \|a - a'\| C_c \|d\|. \end{aligned}$$

We see that if we restrict ourselves to $\|a\|$ and $\|d\|$ small enough (that means if we possibly shrink the set W_0 on which Ψ is defined) we will get

$$\|\tilde{\Psi}(a, d) - \tilde{\Psi}(a', d')\| \leq \sup_{(t,s)} |\delta a(t,s) - \delta a'(t,s)| \leq \frac{1}{6} (\|a - a'\| + \|d - d'\|).$$

This proves the property **D1**. □

Having defined the map Ψ , we can finally define Φ :

$$\Phi(\vec{r}, d) := \Psi(c_{\vec{r}}, d).$$

Since the map $\mathbb{R}^m \ni \vec{r} \mapsto c_{\vec{r}} \in C^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m)$ is Lipschitz with constant 1, the properties **A** – **D** of Φ easily follow from the analogous properties **A1** – **D1** of Ψ . We will now prove the property **E**.

Proof of property E. As one might have expected the existence and the Lipschitz condition for Φ^{-1} will be proven essentially the same as in the standard proof of the inverse function theorem (confront [18]).

First of all, we will establish a pair of linear isomorphism between Banach spaces:

$$\begin{aligned} C^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m) &\xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathbb{R}^m \times C_{\text{Tr}=0}^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m), \\ a(t) &\longmapsto \left(\int_0^1 a(s) ds, a(t) - \int_0^1 a(s) ds \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}^m \times C_{\text{Tr}=0}^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m) &\xrightarrow{\beta} C^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m), \\ (\vec{r}, d(t)) &\longmapsto c_{\vec{r}} + d(t). \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to verify that α and β are continuous inverses of each other and that α is Lipschitz with constant 3.

The map Φ is defined on some open neighbourhood $U_0 \ni (0, 0)$. Take R such that the open ball $B(0, 2R) \subset U_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^m \times C_{\text{Tr}=0}^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m)$. The map $\tilde{\Phi}$ is Lipschitz with constant $\frac{1}{6}$ and α is Lipschitz with constant 3, hence $\alpha \circ \tilde{\Phi}$ is Lipschitz with constant $\frac{1}{2}$ and it maps the ball $B(0, 2R) \subset U_0$ into a ball $B(0, R)$.

Take now any $a \in C^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m)$ such that $\|a\| < \frac{R}{3}$. We shall construct an unique element $(r, d) \in B(0, 2R) \subset U_0$ satisfying $\Phi(r, d) = a$.

Indeed, consider a map $\Phi_a(\vec{r}, d) = \alpha(a - \tilde{\Psi}(\vec{r}, d))$. It follows easily from the properties of α that Φ_a maps the ball $B(0, 2R)$ into itself, and is Lipschitz with constant $\frac{1}{2}$. Now using the Banach theorem for contracting maps, we deduce that Φ_a has an unique fixed point $(\vec{r}, d) \in B(0, 2R)$. Consequently, $a - \tilde{\Psi}(\vec{r}, d) = \beta(\Phi_a(\vec{r}, d)) = \beta(\vec{r}, d) = c_{\vec{r}} + d$, hence $a = \Phi(r, d)$. We have proven the existence of Φ^{-1} .

Take now $a, a' \in C^0(I, \mathbb{R}^m)$ and let $\Phi^{-1}(a) = (\vec{r}, d)$, $\Phi^{-1}(a') = (\vec{r}', d')$. Using the Lipschitz condition for α and $\tilde{\Phi}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\vec{r}, d) - (\vec{r}', d')\| &= \|\Phi_a(\vec{r}, d) - \Phi_{a'}(\vec{r}', d')\| = \|\alpha(a - \tilde{\Phi}(\vec{r}, d)) - \alpha(a' - \tilde{\Phi}(\vec{r}', d'))\| \leq \\ &\leq 3\|a - a'\| + 3\|\tilde{\Phi}(\vec{r}, d) - \tilde{\Phi}(\vec{r}', d')\| \leq 3\|a - a'\| + 3\frac{1}{6}\|(\vec{r}, d) - (\vec{r}', d')\|. \end{aligned}$$

At the end

$$\|\Phi^{-1}(a) - \Phi^{-1}(a')\| = \|(\vec{r}, d) - (\vec{r}', d')\| \leq 6\|a - a'\|.$$

The property **E** has been proven. $\square$

This finishes the proof of proposition 7.4 and, in consequence, lemma 6.6 and the whole Maximum Principle. $\square$

Remark 7.5. In the proof we assumed that there exist symbols $\mathfrak{w}$, $\mathfrak{w}_i$, $\mathfrak{v}_i$ such that $\dot{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathfrak{w}}(0)$ are $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \pm e_i$. This was not completely true, since $\mathbf{K}_\tau^u$ is defined as a closure of the space of all $\mathbf{d}^{\mathfrak{w}}(0)$'s. However, what was really important in the proof was the existence of the family of continuous paths $\mathbf{d}^{\mathfrak{w}(\vec{r})}(t)$ parameterized by a convex set $B \ni \vec{r}$ such that the set of elements $\mathbf{d}^{\mathfrak{w}(\vec{r})}(0)$ covers the set $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}\} \times U \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m$, where U is an open neighborhood of zero in $\mathbb{R}^m$. We can always choose symbols $\mathfrak{w}$, $\mathfrak{w}_i$, $\mathfrak{v}_i$ such that $\mathbf{d}^{\mathfrak{w}}(0)$'s are arbitrary close to $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \pm e_i$. It is clear that the set of elements $\mathbf{d}^{\mathfrak{w}(\vec{r})}(0)$ with $\mathfrak{w}(\vec{r})$ defined as in the above proof will have the desired properties.

8 Examples.

8.1 Pontryagin Maximum Principle for non-autonomous control systems.

Consider now a time dependent optimal control problem on an AL algebroid E . Assume, namely, that our control and cost functions depend on one additional real parameter (time): $f : M \times \mathbb{R} \times U \longrightarrow E$, $L : M \times \mathbb{R} \times U \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We assume that the dependence of both, f and L , on the additional parameter is of class C^1 . Our problem is to find an admissible control $u(t)$ with $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ (this time the interval is fixed), such that the associated trajectory $f(x(t), t, u(t))$ is equivalent to a class $[\sigma]$ of fixed E -path σ with initial base-point x_0 and, moreover, the total cost $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} L(x(t), t, u(t))dt$ is minimal among all such controls. (Here $x(t)$ is of course the solution of the differential equation $\dot{x}(t) = \rho(f(x(t), t, u(t)))$ with initial condition x_0).

In the above situation the following version of the Pontryagin Maximum Principle holds.

Theorem 8.1. *Let $u : [t_0, t_1] \longrightarrow U$ be a solution of the above optimal control problem. There exists a curve $z : [t_0, t_1] \longrightarrow E^*$ (with initial base-point x_0) and a number $z_0 \leq 0$ such that:*

- *the curve $z(t)$ is a trajectory of the time-dependent family of Hamiltonian vector fields $\mathcal{X}_{H_t}$ associated with the Hamiltonians $H_t(z) = H(z, t, u(t))$, where*

$$H(z, t, u) = \langle f(\pi(z), t, u), z \rangle_\tau + z_0 L(\pi(z), t, u) ;$$

- *the pair $u(t)$ and $z(t)$ satisfies the "Maximum Principle"*

$$H(z(t), u(t)) = \sup_{v \in U} H(z(t), v)$$

at every point of continuity of the control u ;

- *if $z_0 = 0$ the covector $z(t)$ is nowhere-vanishing;*

- $\frac{d}{dt}H(\xi(t), u(t)) = z_i(t)\frac{\partial f^i}{\partial t}(x(t), t, u(t)) + z_0\frac{\partial L}{\partial t}(x(t), t, u(t))$ at every point of continuity of the control u .

Remark 8.2. Observe that in particular for time-independent optimal control problem with fixed time interval $[t_0, t_1]$ the last condition means that $H(z(t), u(t))$ is constant with respect to t . Whereas for the free interval we know that $H(z(t), u(t)) \equiv 0$ (compare theorem 1.1).

Proof. The above time-dependent optimal control problem on E can be regarded as a time-independent problem on an algebroid $E \times \mathbb{T}\mathbb{R}$ with modified control function $\tilde{f} = (f, 1) : M \times \mathbb{R} \times U \longrightarrow E \times \mathbb{T}\mathbb{R}$. Observe that the pair $[\sigma], [t_0, t_1]$ determines an equivalence class of admissible paths in $E \times \mathbb{T}\mathbb{R}$ (admissible path in a product algebroid is a pair of admissible paths on its components, and the equivalence class in $\mathbb{T}\mathbb{R}$ is determined by two points in $\mathbb{R}$ as $\mathbb{R}$ is simple-connected). Now, using the theorem 1.1 for an algebroid $E \times \mathbb{T}\mathbb{R}$, we know that there exists a number $z_0 \leq 0$ and a curve $(z(t), \xi(t)) \in E^* \times \mathbb{T}^*\mathbb{R}$ (with initial base point (x_0, t_0)) which is Hamiltonian with respect to

$$\tilde{H}(z, \xi, u) = \langle f(\pi(z), \pi_{\mathbb{R}}(\xi), u), z \rangle_{\tau} + \langle 1, \xi \rangle_{\tau_{\mathbb{R}}} + z_0 L(\pi(z), \pi_{\mathbb{R}}(\xi), u) = H(z, \pi_{\mathbb{R}}(\xi), u) + \xi.$$

The evolution of $\pi_{\mathbb{R}}(\xi(t))$ is given by an equation $\partial_t \pi_{\mathbb{R}}(\xi(t)) = 1$ with initial condition $\pi_{\mathbb{R}}(\xi(t_0)) = t_0$, hence $\pi_{\mathbb{R}}(\xi(t)) = t$. It follows easily, that the evolution of $\xi(t)$ is given by an equation

$$\partial_t \xi(t) = -z_i(t)\frac{\partial f^i}{\partial t}(z(t), t, u(t)) - z_0\frac{\partial L}{\partial t}(z(t), t, u(t)).$$

On the other hand we know that $\tilde{H}(z(t), \xi(t), u(t)) = H(z(t), t, u(t)) + \xi(t) \equiv 0$ at every point of continuity of control u . Consequently $H(z(t), t, u(t)) = -\xi(t)$. $\square$

8.2 The falling cat problem.

Consider the following problem. Let M be the Riemannian manifold with metric g and let $G \longrightarrow Q \longrightarrow M$ be the principal G -bundle over M . Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a given G -invariant connection on Q . We are looking for a curve $q(t) \in Q$ (where $t \in [0, 1]$) joining two fixed points q_0 and q_1 in Q which is horizontal with respect to $\mathcal{A}$ and such, that $x(t)$ – its projection to M minimizes the energy integral

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 g(\dot{x}(t), \dot{x}(t)) dt \longrightarrow \min.$$

In literature this problem is called the Falling Cat Problem or the Isoholonomic Problem (compare [5] and [3, chapter 7.1]) and is solved with help of the Lagrange multipliers technique. We will treat it as the optimal control problem on Lie algebroid of G -invariant vector fields on Q (so called Atiyah algebroid) $E := \mathbb{T}Q/G$.

First of all observe that the Falling Cat Problem can be regarded as an optimal control problem on $\mathbb{T}Q$. If $q(t)$ is a horizontal curve it is determined by an initial point $q(0)$ and the base path $x(t)$. Consequently, taking base velocities as control parameters every horizontal curve can be treated as a trajectory of the control system on $\mathbb{T}Q$ with control function $F(q, u) = h_{\mathcal{A}}(q, u)$ – the horizontal lift of the base velocity to $\mathbb{T}Q$. The condition of minimizing the energy integral can be interpreted in this language as looking for an optimal trajectory of the system F with the cost function $L(q, u) = \frac{1}{2}g(\tau_M(q))(u, u)$. Now it follows from the G -equivariance of F and G -invariance of L that this optimal control problem projects to the optimal control problem on $\mathbb{T}Q/G$ with fixed time interval $[t_0, t_1] = [0, 1]$ and homotopy class of E -paths determined by points $q_0, q_1 \in Q$.

Choose local coordinates (x^a) on M . We have the induced coordinates $(x^a, \dot{x}^b)$ on $\mathbb{T}M$. Denote by $g_{ab}(x)$ the coordinates of the metric g . As we said before base-velocities $\dot{x}^a =: u^a$ will serve as our control parameters. Consequently the set of control parameters is $U = \mathbb{R}^n$.

If we fix a local trivialization of Q it is possible to identify the Atiyah algebroid $E = \mathbb{T}Q/G$ with a bundle $\mathbb{T}M \times \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow M$ equipped with a product Lie algebroid structure (here $\mathfrak{g}$ stands of course for the Lie algebra of the group G). Hence we have local coordinates (x^a, u^b, y^i) on E . In this coordinates the anchor is $\rho_b^a(x) = \delta_b^a$, $\rho_i^a(x) = 0$ and the bracket equals c_{jk}^i – the bracket on $\mathfrak{g}$. Since the connection is G -invariant it projects to E . Every horizontal vector is of the form

$$f(x, u) = (x^a, u^b, -A_b^i(x)u^b),$$

where $A_b^i(x)$ is the $\mathfrak{g}$ valued form of the connection $\mathcal{A}$. The function f is a control function of our control system on E and $L(x, u) = \frac{1}{2}g_{ab}(x)u^a u^b$ is the cost function.

Let us now use the Pontryagin Maximum Principle (version 8.1). Assume that $(x(t), u(t))$ is the solution of the optimal control problem on E . We know that there exists a number $z_0 \leq 0$ and a curve $(x^a(t), p_b(t), \xi_i(t)) \in \mathbb{T}^*M \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ with the following properties.

The evolution of $p_b(t)$ and $\xi_i(t)$ is given by the equations

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t p_b(t) = \frac{\partial A_a^i(x)}{\partial x^b} u^a(t) \xi_i(t) - z_0 \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial g_{ac}(x)}{\partial x^b} u^a(t) u^c(t) \\ \partial_t \xi_j(t) = -c_{ij}^k A_b^i(x) u^b(t) \xi_k(t) \end{cases}$$

Moreover, the Hamiltonian

$$H(x(t), p(t), \xi(t), v) = p_b(t)v^b - \xi_i(t)A_b^i(x)v^b + z_0 \frac{1}{2}g_{ab}(x)v^a v^c,$$

takes its maximum at $v = u(t)$ and, what is more, $H(x(t), p(t), \xi(t), u(t))$ is constant in time.

From the maximum condition it follows that $\tilde{p}_a(t) := p_a(t) - A_a^i(x)\xi_i(t) = -z_0 g_{ab}(x)u^b(t)$. It is now straightforward to verify that the following equations are satisfied.

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{p}_b(t) = -B_{ba}^i(x)u^a(t)\xi_i(t) - z_0 \frac{\partial g_{ac}(x)}{\partial x^b} u^a(t) u^c(t), \\ \partial_t \xi_j(t) = -c_{ij}^k A_b^i(x)u^b(t)\xi_k(t), \end{cases}$$

where $B_{ab}^i(x)$ is the curvature of the connection $\mathcal{A}$. In the normal case $z_0 = -1$ we recognise the Wong equations ([5, 3]). Note that the condition $H(z(t), u(t)) = \text{const}$ implies that $z_0 g_{ab}(x)u^a u^b$ is constant, hence in the normal case the velocity is constant on the optimal trajectory.

8.3 Time-optimal problem on $\mathfrak{so}(3)$.

Consider now a rigid body in $\mathbb{R}^3$ which can rotate with constant angular velocity along two fixed axes in the body. At every moment the position of the body is described by an element $q \in SO(3)$. The rotation axes can be represented by elements of the Lie algebra of $SO(3)$ $l_+, l_- \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$. The rotation along the axis $l_{\pm}$ is described by an equation:

$$\partial_t q = q l_{\pm}.$$

It would be suitable to write $l_+ = a + b$ and $l_- = a - b$. The above equation can be regarded as a control system on a Lie group $SO(3)$ with control function $F(q, u) = qf(u)$, where $f(u) = a + ub$ and the set of controls is simply $U = \{-1, 1\}$. We would like to find the control $u(t)$ which moves the body from the position $q_0 \in SO(3)$ to $q_1 \in SO(3)$ in the shortest possible time.

It is obvious that the above optimal control problem on a Lie group reduces to the optimal control problem on a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ with control function f and cost function $L \equiv 1$.

Fix a basis (e_1, e_2, e_3) on $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ and denoted by c_{jk}^i the structure constants of the Lie algebra in this basis. Using theorem 1.1 we will obtain the following result. Let $u(t)$ for $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ be

the solution of the above optimal control problem. There exist a number $z_0 \leq 0$ and a curve $z(t) \in \mathfrak{so}(3)^*$ such that.

$$H(z(t), u(t)) = \langle z(t), a + u(t)b \rangle + z_0 = \max_{v=\pm 1} \langle z(t), a + vb \rangle + z_0.$$

This implies $u(t) = \text{sgn}(\langle z(t), b \rangle)$. Moreover the evolution of $z(t)$ is given by the equation

$$\partial_t z_j(t) = c_{ij}^k (a^i + u(t)b^i) z_k(t).$$

We have obtained the same equation as in ([1, section 19.4]). We refer to this book for the detailed discussion on solutions.

References

- [1] A. A. Agrachev, Yu. L. Sachkov: Control Theory from the Geometric Viewpoint, Springer, 2004
- [2] W. I. Arnol'd: Ordinary differential equations, Springer, 1992.
- [3] A. M. Bloch: Nonholonomic Mechanics and Control, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.
- [4] A. Cannas da Silva, A. Weinstein: Geometric models for Noncommutative Algebras, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1999.
- [5] H. Cendra, D. D. Holm, J. E. Marsden, T. S. Ratiu: Lagrangian reduction, the Euler-Poincaré equations, and semidirect products, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl., **186** (1998), 1-25.
- [6] J. Clemente-Gallardo: Applications of Lie algebroids in mechanics and control theory. Non-linear control in the year 2000, Vol. 1 (Paris), 299–313, *Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci.* **258**, Springer, London, 2001.
- [7] J. Cortés, M. de Leon, J.C. Marrero, D. Martin de Diego and E. Martínez: A Survey of Lagrangian Mechanics and Control on Lie algebroids and groupoids, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys* **3** (2006), 509–558.
- [8] J. Cortés and E. Martínez: Mechanical Control systems on Lie algebroids, *IMA J. Math. Control. Inform.* **21** (2004), 457–492.
- [9] M. Crainic, R. L. Fernandes: Integrability of Lie brackets, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **157** (2003) 575–620.
- [10] J. Grabowski: Quasi-derivations and QD-algebroids, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **32** (2003), 445–451.
- [11] K. Grabowska, J. Grabowski and P. Urbański: Geometrical Mechanics on algebroids, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **3** (2006), 559–575.
- [12] K. Grabowska, J. Grabowski: Variational calculus with constraints on general algebroids, to appear in *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **41** (2008), 175204 (25pp).
- [13] J. Grabowski, M. de Leon, J. C. Marrero, D. Martin de Diego: Nonholonomic Constraints: a New Viewpoint, *J. Math. Phys.* **50** (2009), 013520 (17pp).
- [14] J. Grabowski, M. Rotkiewicz: Higher vector bundles and multi-graded symplectic manifolds, preprint, arxiv: *math.DG/0702772*.
- [15] J. Grabowski and P. Urbański: Tangent lifts of Poisson and related structures, *J. Phys. A* **28** (1995), 6743–6777.
- [16] J. Grabowski and P. Urbański: Algebroids – general differential calculi on vector bundles, *J. Geom. Phys.* **31** (1999), 111–141.
- [17] J. Grabowski and P. Urbański: Lie algebroids and Poisson-Nijenhuis structures, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **40**, (1997), 195–208.

- [18] S. Lang: Differential Manifolds , Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985.
- [19] K. Konieczna and P. Urbański: Double vector bundles and duality, *Arch. Math. (Brno)* **35**, (1999), 59–95.
- [20] M. de Leon, J. Cortés, D. Martin de Diego and S. Martínez: General symmetries in optimal control, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **53** (2004), 55–78.
- [21] M. de León, J. C. Marrero, E. Martínez: Lagrangian submanifolds and dynamics on Lie algebroids, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **38** (2005), R241–R308.
- [22] P. Libermann: Lie algebroids and mechanics, *Archivum Mathematicum* **32**, (1996), 147–162.
- [23] K. C. H. Mackenzie: General theory of Lie groupoids and Lie algebroids, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [24] E. Martínez: Lagrangian Mechanics on Lie Algebroids, *Acta Appl. Math.* **67**, (2001), 295–320.
- [25] E. Martínez: Geometric formulation of Mechanics on Lie algebroids, in *Proceedings of the VIII Fall Workshop on Geometry and Physics, Medina del Campo, 1999, Publicaciones de la RSME*, **2**, (2001), 209–222.
- [26] E. Martínez: Reduction in optimal control theory, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **53** (2004), no. 1, 79–90.
- [27] E. Martínez: Classical field theory on Lie algebroids: Variational aspects, *J. Phys A* **38** (2005), 7145–7160.
- [28] E. Martinez: Variational calculus on Lie algebroids, preprint arXiv:math-ph/0603028v2.
- [29] E. Martinez: Lie algebroids in classical mechanics and optimal control, *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.* **3** (2007), Paper 050, 17 pp. (electronic).
- [30] L. S. Pontryagin, V. G. Boltjanskij, R. V. Gamkrelidze, E. F. Miscenko: Mathematische Theorie optimaler Prozesse, VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1964.
- [31] W. Tulczyjew: Hamiltonian systems, Lagrangian systems, and the Legendre transformation, *Symposia Math.* **14**, (1974), 101–114.
- [32] W.M. Tulczyjew and P. Urbański: A slow and careful Legendre transformation for singular Lagrangians, *The Infeld Centennial Meeting (Warsaw, 1998)*, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **30**, (1999), 2909–2978.
- [33] P. Urbański: Double vector bundles in classical mechanics, *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Pol. Torino* **54**, (1996), 405–421.
- [34] A. J. van der Schaft: Symmetries in optimal control, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **25** (1987), no. 2, 245–259.
- [35] A. Weinstein: Lagrangian mechanics and grupoids, *Fields Inst. Comm.* **7** (1996), 207–231.
- [36] K. Yano and S. Ishihara: Tangent and Cotangent Bundles, *Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York*, (1973).
- [37] S. Zakrzewski: Quantum and classical pseudogroups, I and II, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **134** (1990), 347–370, 371–395.

Janusz Grabowski
 Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences
 Śniadeckich 8, P.O. Box 21, 00-956 Warszawa, Poland
 jgrab@impan.gov.pl

Michał Józwiowski
 Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences
 Śniadeckich 8, P.O. Box 21, 00-956 Warszawa, Poland
 mjoz@impan.gov.pl